

Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation

The purpose of this article is to indicate that Luke's account of the forgiving of the sinful woman (7,36-50) is modelled, largely but not exclusively, on the two women described in 2 Kgs 4,1-37, the woman who was freed from a great debt (vv. 1-7), and the Shunammite woman who received an awesome gift of life (vv. 8-37).

Unlike the OT text however, with its apparent emphasis on gifts which are external — freedom from *financial* debt (vv. 1-7), and the granting of *physical* life (vv. 8-37) — the gospel account stresses gifts which are primarily internal — freedom from *moral* debt and the granting of *spiritual* life. Thus Luke's account emerges not as a slavish copy of the older text but as a sophisticated internalization. This process of internalization, and Luke's other processes of adaptation, are to be understood not only in the context of the general NT emphasis on what is internal and spiritual, but also in the context of the rhetorical practice of *imitatio*.

The article consists of seven parts: (I) A summary of some aspects of the present discussion about the source of Luke 7,36-50. (II) A very brief survey of the way in which rhetorical imitation casts light on the use of sources. (III) A survey of the evidence concerning Luke's use of, and even imitation of, the LXX, especially of the Elijah-Elisha narrative. (IV) An introductory analysis of Luke 7,36-50 and 2 Kgs 4,1-37. (V) A detailed analysis of Luke 7,36-50 and 2 Kgs 4,1-37. (VI) A general assessment of method and data. (VII) Summary of main results.

I. The Origin of Luke 7,36-50: A Problem in Stalemate

The origin of Luke 7,36-50 has always been a puzzle⁽¹⁾. On some points, particularly in its image of a woman anointing Jesus,

⁽¹⁾ According to L. V. SYBEL ("Die Salbungen", ZNW 23 [1924] 184-193, esp. 185) Luke 7,36-50 is the most difficult of all Synoptic pericopes.

the passage is strikingly similar to the anointing stories found in Mark 14,3-9 and John 12,1-8⁽²⁾. (Matthew's version, 26,6-13, appears to be a minor variation on Mark's). But while Luke sets the scene in Galilee, at a rather early stage in Jesus' ministry, the other gospels give a very different setting: Bethany, some days before Jesus' death. Besides, the basic theme of sin-and-forgiveness, which is so essential to the Lukan account, is nowhere mentioned in the Bethany account. In fact, Luke's text and context are so different from the other accounts that even though most scholars believe that Luke's gospel generally depends on Mark, many see serious objections to applying that dependence to Luke 7,36-50⁽³⁾. Thus from a literary point of view, Luke 7,36-50 seems not to depend on any of the other gospels. Luke, it appears, had some source of his own, but it is not at all clear what that source might be, nor how the literary similarities between the various anointing accounts developed.

One of the most usual methods of responding to the data, to the complex array of similarities and dissimilarities, is to attempt immediately to reconstruct an historical background which could explain the oddly differing accounts. Was there, in history, in Jesus' life, just one event, which was handed on in different ways? Or were there two events which, in the process of transmission, became confused?

Repeated use of this method has shown that it is not fruitful. Admittedly, it seems in some ways to be an obvious line of inquiry,

G. BOUWMAN ("La Pécheresse Hospitalière", *ETL* 45 [1969] 172-179, esp. 172) refers to it as a "*crux interpretum notoire*". For a brief survey of research, see R. HOLST, "The One Anointing of Jesus: Another Application of the Form-Critical Method", *JBL* 95 (1976) 435-446, esp. 435-436. For a bibliography, see J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB; New York 1981) 693-694.

(²) For a table comparing details, see R. E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John I-XII* (AB; New York 1966) 450.

(³) See, for instance, B. H. STREETER, *The Four Gospels. A Study in Origins* (London 1924) 210; J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London 1966) 99; H. SCHÜRMAN, *Das Lukasevangelium: Erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-9,50* (HTKNT 3/1; Freiburg 1969) 441; FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 684. The most elaborate analysis of the passage, however, that of J. DELOBEL ("L'Onction par la Pécheresse. La composition littéraire de Lc., vii,36-50", *ETL* 42 [1966] 414-475, esp. 474-475) opts tentatively for its partial dependence on Mark.

and it represents a concern which ultimately must be met. But it would appear to be one of those instances where "the historical question is posed prematurely"⁽⁴⁾, and it certainly does not yield results. The most meticulous weighing of the data has not been able to indicate, with any decisiveness, whether there was one event or two. It is symptomatic of the inadequacy of the data for solving the problem that while Schürmann and Brown see two events, Dodd and Fitzmyer opt for one⁽⁵⁾.

It appears therefore that discussion of the literary and historical origin of Luke 7,36-50 has reached a kind of stalemate. In view of this impasse, it seems appropriate to try a different approach.

II. Rhetorical Imitation and the Use of Sources

It has often been said about Luke that he was a literary artist in the Hellenistic mold⁽⁶⁾, but the implications of this statement have never been fully spelled out. One of the most basic implications is that he probably used the rhetorical practice of imitation, i.e., the common literary practice of taking sources, particularly old sources, and transforming them in various ways, often highly ingenious and complex ways, into a new text⁽⁷⁾. In fact, the practice was so com-

⁽⁴⁾ R. S. SARASON, analyzing the heritage of Gunkel in "Towards a New Agendum for the Study of Rabbinic Midrashic Literature", *Joseph Heine-mann Memorial Volume* (eds. J. J. Petuchowski and E. Fleischer) forthcoming.

⁽⁵⁾ SCHÜRMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 441; BROWN, *John I-XII*, 449-451; C. H. DODD, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1963) 162-173; FITZMYER, *Luke I-XII*, 685-686. An examination of the items in Fitzmyer's bibliography (*Luke I-IX*, 693-694) increases rather than alleviates the impression of stalemate.

⁽⁶⁾ See esp. E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller* (Göttingen 1971); FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 92, 107.

⁽⁷⁾ For a general survey of classical imitation, see T. L. BRODIE, "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources", *Luke-Acts. New Perspectives* (ed. C. H. Talbert) (New York 1983). For an examination of the main classical texts dealing with the theory of imitation, see T. M. GREEN, *The Light in Troy. Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven-London 1982) 54-80. For a brief bibliography, see T. L. BRODIE, "The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth (1 Kgs 21,8-13) as One

mon that almost the entire literature of the Roman empire, whether in Greek or Latin, may be described as consisting in origin of an imitation of older Greek literature⁽⁸⁾. Thus, when Quintilian was producing his survey of literary theory and practice (c. 95 A.D.), he stated, as an unquestionable principle, that a large part of literary art consists of imitation (“... *artis pars magna contineatur imitatione*”)⁽⁹⁾.

It may seem surprising that so basic an aspect of literary composition, and Luke's possible use of it, has received little attention. Yet it is understandable. Rhetoric and imitation continued to flourish in various forms through the Middle Ages and also during and after the Renaissance, but about the year 1800, largely because of the emphasis placed by romanticism on individuality and sheer originality, rhetoric (including imitation) was banished from the world of art and literature⁽¹⁰⁾. And it was during the period of banishment that the modern study of the NT really developed. As a result, even when the NT was examined from a literary point of view, little or no attention was paid to rhetoric and rhetorical imitation. It is only in recent years that the rhetorical features of the NT have begun to emerge⁽¹¹⁾. Though such studies are still undeveloped, there is al-

Component of the Stephen Text (Acts 6,9-14; 7,58 a)”, *CBQ*, 45 (1983) 417-432, esp. p. 429.

⁽⁸⁾ G. KENNEDY, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition* (Chapel Hill 1980) 118. See esp. J. HIGGINBOTHAM (ed.), *Greek and Latin Literature. A Comparative Study* (London 1969).

⁽⁹⁾ QUINTILIAN, *Inst. Orat.*, X, ii, 1.

⁽¹⁰⁾ See esp. Kurt WEINBERG, “Romanticism”, *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* (Princeton 1975); W.J. ONG, *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology* (Ithaca-London 1971) 255-83, esp. 255-261, 276-279. The case for abandoning imitation seems to have been first articulated in Edward Young's “Conjectures on Original Composition” (1759). Young's essay may be found in C. KAPLAN, *Criticism: The Major Statements* (New York 1975) 220-250.

⁽¹¹⁾ Note esp. the thesis that Galatians is not a passionate outburst but a carefully constructed rhetorical composition: H. D. BETZ, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1979). Note also the “conscious and intentional” use of rhetorical diatribe in Romans: S. K. STOWERS, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBLDS 57; Chico 1981) esp. 76, 178. On the relation of research on rhetorical *topoi* to NT studies, see W. H. WUELLNER, “Toposforschung und Torah-interpretation bei Paulus und Jesus”, *NTS* 24 (1977-78) 463-483.

ready enough evidence to show that it is very likely that Luke "received at least a basic training in rhetorical rules and practice"⁽¹²⁾. In the light of this probability, and in the light of the pervasiveness of the practice of imitation, it is reasonable that a discussion of Luke's use of sources should include a discussion of imitation.

Ideally this article should now give a full description of imitation. But apart from the inherent difficulties of such a task, there is not enough space and, in any case, the more essential information is available elsewhere⁽¹³⁾. Some basic points, however, need to be noted.

Rhetoric was not confined to politicians and speech-makers. It was a basic element in the educational system and its rules governed virtually every kind of literary composition, including poetry and historiography⁽¹⁴⁾.

Rhetorical imitation (Greek *mimēsis*; Latin *imitatio*) is concerned above all with the imitation of existing literature — not with the imitation of nature. The idea of imitation as a reproduction of nature or reality goes all the way from Aristotle⁽¹⁵⁾ to E. Auerbach⁽¹⁶⁾, but the idea of imitation as an adaptation of existing art or literature is at least equally old. Isocrates, the long-lived teacher of rhetoric who was Aristotle's rival and older contemporary, taught his many pupils to imitate previous rhetoricians, and it was partly because of Isocrates' influence that rhetorical imitation became what it did — the careful copying and adapting of previous writers, particularly of ancient or "canonical" writings⁽¹⁷⁾.

Imitation was concerned not just with style but also with content. Existing narratives and dramas were incorporated into new writings. Thus, Homer's history was taken over almost completely

⁽¹²⁾ W. S. KURZ, "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts", *CBQ* 42 (1980) 171-195, esp. 195.

⁽¹³⁾ BRODIE, "Greco-Roman Imitation".

⁽¹⁴⁾ KURZ, "Hellenistic Rhetoric," 184-195; G. S. BALDWIN, *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic* (New York 1924) 224-225; J. F. DALTON, *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism. A Study in Tendencies* (New York 1962) 438-524.

⁽¹⁵⁾ E.g., see *Physics*, II, 2.194a22; II, 8.199a15-17.

⁽¹⁶⁾ *Mimesis. The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Princeton 1953).

⁽¹⁷⁾ E.g., see ISOCRATES, *Against the Sophists*, 17-18. On Isocrates, see A. LESKY, *A History of Greek Literature* (New York 1968) 582-592.

by Virgil, and many of the Greek tragic dramas were adapted by Seneca⁽¹⁸⁾.

Imitation was not slavish. Instead of reproducing a source verbatim, the writer almost always sought to transform it, to rival and surpass it. In fact, the notion of imitation became virtually interchangeable with that of rivalry or emulation (Greek *zēlos*; Latin *emulatio*). And the ways of adapting the source-text were almost endless. However, Greco-Roman critics did not have a general abstract theory which would encompass this endless range of creativity. Instead they used a series of metaphors. Imitation is described variously as a process of inspection, contemplation, wrestling, pioneering, digesting, honey-making, a process of being impregnated by the old text, so that the old text and the author combine to produce something quite new⁽¹⁹⁾.

The actual practice of imitating or emulating involved a considerable range of techniques of adaptation. Among the most basic were those of compression (or abbreviation) and expansion. A more complex technique was that of fusing and dividing. In this process characters or actions which in the source were quite distinct, in the new text were fused into one. Or alternatively single elements of the source text were divided in the process of rewriting. Other techniques could be mentioned but the choice would be selective. It is symptomatic of the extent to which imitation was spurned by the spirit of romanticism that apparently there does not exist today a major general study of the various techniques of Greco-Roman imitation⁽²⁰⁾. The absence of such an elementary tool, plus the inherent complexity of imitation, means that the researcher has to advance largely by a process of groping. It also helps to account for the fact that there is no established method of unraveling the processes of imitation and the complex literary relationships which result from them. This lack of an established method is a problem to which we shall return.

⁽¹⁸⁾ For details, see esp. HIGGINBOTHAM, *Greek and Latin Literature*.

⁽¹⁹⁾ For details, see GREEN, *The Light in Troy*, 58-80.

⁽²⁰⁾ This lack has been confirmed by George Steiner of Cambridge (in discussion, December 1979) and by Richard Thomas, Classics Department, Harvard (in discussion, July 1982). Steiner commented that when writing *After Babel* (see note 25) he looked for such a book and could not find one.

One of the techniques of imitation was that of internalization, a shifting of focus from external attributes and actions to various qualities and developments that were more internal. The roots of this process lie deep in Greek culture and are probably seen most clearly in the tendency, found especially in the Ionian thinkers, to change the focus of interest from the gods to what goes on within people⁽²¹⁾, and in the partial replacement of the warlike heroism of the Homeric tradition by the quiet heroism of Socrates⁽²²⁾. Virgil, who was apparently the most esteemed writer of imperial Rome, carried this process of internalization further, for not only did he imitate and rival Homer in every way, but he consistently sought to replace the warlike Homeric heroes by the image of a hero who could indeed fight fiercely but who was above all a man of internal qualities — *pius Aeneas*. Thus, where Achilles at one point emphasizes physical strength (“As long as... my good knees have their strength”) Virgil, in a complete reshaping of the passage, depicts Aeneas as emphasizing something far more internal (“... While I remember who I am”)⁽²³⁾.

Further instances of the process of internalization may be found, for instance, in two of the most outstanding writers of the NT period — Seneca and Tacitus. Thus, when Tacitus was describing even such a wellknown event as the coup which brought Otho to power (69 A.D.), he did not hesitate to describe the onlooking populace through a formula which reflected a stereotyped description of a crowd, but he adapted that description so that it focussed on factors that were internal — the crowd’s silent emotions⁽²⁴⁾. And concerning Seneca’s adaptations of Euripides, written about 60 A.D., it has been said that “Seneca’s tragedies... are modulations of Euri-

⁽²¹⁾ See G. GUSDORF, *Les Sciences Humaines et la Pensée Occidentale, II: Les Origines des Sciences Humaines* (Paris 1967) 24-33. More briefly, see GUSDORF, “Humanistic Scholarship, History of”, *Encyclopedia Britannica* (31974), *Macropaedia*, 8, 1170-1179, esp. 1171.

⁽²²⁾ See A. W. H. ADKINS, *Merit and Responsibility. A Study in Greek Values* (Oxford 1960) 33, 57, 259-315, esp. 259; E. A. HAVELOCK, *The Greek Concept of Justice. From Its Shadow in Homer to Its Substance in Plato* (Cambridge, MA - London 1978) esp. 137, 307.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. *Iliad*, ix, 609; *Aeneid*, iv, 336.

⁽²⁴⁾ *Hist.*, I, 40. See BRODIE, “Greco-Roman Imitation”.

pides. . . Drawing on aspects of technique latent in Euripides, Seneca wholly internalizes the action”⁽²⁵⁾.

These comments about imitation and its techniques are brief indeed, yet, like a few leading landmarks, they should be enough to provide a basic sense of direction.

The general conclusion of all that has been said so far is that, on the one hand, there is a problem about the origin or source of Luke 7,36-50, and on the other, that the study of rhetorical imitation helps us understand how sources were used. What remains to be seen is whether this increased sensitivity to how sources were generally used can cast any light on how sources were used by Luke — particularly in his account of the sinful woman.

III. Luke and the Use of the LXX

Of all the documents which we still possess, it is generally agreed that Luke had intimate acquaintance with at least two — Mark’s gospel and the LXX. His massive dependence on Mark is fairly evident but his relationship to the LXX remains something of a puzzle. To some degree this is to be expected. Since Mark’s gospel spoke directly of Christ, it could be incorporated with little change into Luke’s narrative. The OT also spoke of Christ, as Luke’s own text emphasizes (24,25-27.44-46), but not in the same direct way. It could not have been incorporated unchanged as Mark was. That he should have treated these two texts differently therefore is understandable.

One thing seems clear: as far as *form* is concerned Luke’s literary indebtedness to the LXX is immense. There is continuity of literary genre, of narrative technique, and of vocabulary and style⁽²⁶⁾. In fact, Luke’s style has been described precisely as a *mimēsis* of the style of the LXX⁽²⁷⁾.

As far as *content* is concerned, however, Luke’s indebtedness to the LXX is not at all as clear. Yet it was quite usual in imitation

⁽²⁵⁾ G. STEINER, *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation* (New York-London 1975) 431.

⁽²⁶⁾ For references, see BRODIE, “Greco-Roman Imitation”, notes 133-135.

⁽²⁷⁾ See esp. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*, 38-72, esp. 63-64.

to imitate both style and content. And the implication of saying that Moses and the prophets spoke of Christ and were fulfilled in him (Luke 24,25-27.44-46) is that there is above all a certain continuity of content. If so, where? And of what kind?

Luke himself provides a generous clue. In the programmatic Nazareth speech (Luke 4,16-30), the models for Jesus are Elijah and Elisha. It has been noted, too, that at various points of Luke's text the actions of Jesus seem by turn both to reflect and correct those of Elijah and Elisha⁽²⁸⁾. Such a mixture of reflection and correction fits exactly with the basic dynamics of *imitatio* and *emulatio*.

An enigmatic relationship to the figures of Elijah and Elisha is particularly noticeable in one of the first distinctively Lukan blocks — Luke 7,1-8,3. Elijah and Elisha are not named but the text stands in careful continuity with the Elijah-Elisha theme of the Nazareth speech. Thus, while the Nazareth speech likened Jesus to a prophet and invoked the precedent of Elijah and Elisha as ministering, one to a widow, and the other to a foreign officer (Luke 4,24-27; cf. 1 Kings 17, and 2 Kings 5), Luke 7 begins by showing Jesus ministering to a foreign centurion and a widow, and by declaring him to be "a great prophet" (cf. Luke 7,1-17, esp. v. 16). In other words, the block begins by showing Jesus fulfilling in a new way the ministry of Elijah and Elisha. And the block is a unit⁽²⁹⁾. Its themes are deftly interwoven and developed, including its theme of Jesus and John as prophets (cf. Luke 7,16.19.26.39). Nowhere else in the gospels is there such a sustained emphasis on the role of Jesus and John as prophets. In fact, this unified block puts such emphasis on the idea of twin prophets and especially on the precedent of Elijah and Elisha that if continuity and adaptation of content may reasonably be looked for between any part of Luke and any part of the OT it may reasonably be looked for between this block and the Elijah-Elisha narrative. The plausibility of such continuity is strengthened by the fact that one of the first incidents in this block, the raising of the widow's son (Luke 7,11-17), appears to be a careful

⁽²⁸⁾ See FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 213-215.

⁽²⁹⁾ On the unity of Luke 7,1-8,3 and its continuity with Luke 4,16-30, see L. T. JOHNSON, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 39; Missoula 1977) 91-103. For FITZMYER, (*Luke I-IX*, 647-8) the reference to Jesus as a great prophet (7,16) is "the keynote" to all of 7,1-8,3.

literary imitation of one of the first incidents in the Elijah-Elisha narrative (the raising of the son of the widow of Zarephath, 1 Kgs 17,17-24)⁽³⁰⁾.

With regard to Luke 7,36-50 we find therefore, that on the one hand there is a problem as to its origin. And on the other there is the plausibility of the dependence of some of Luke's text on the OT, and especially of 7,1-8,3 on the Elijah-Elisha narrative. It is in such a context that we ask if 7,36-50 is related to 2 Kgs 4,1-37.

IV. 2 Kgs 4,1-37 and Luke 7,36-50: Introductory Analysis

As one scans the Elijah-Elisha narrative, asking whether any of its episodes have anything to do with Luke's account of the sinful woman, there are a number of reasons why 2 Kgs 4,1-37 attracts attention. The first is that, like Luke 7,36-50, its tone is significantly feminine. Few passages in the Elijah-Elisha narrative put so great an emphasis on the presence of women. Such a similarity, of course, is only a straw in the wind, yet it is not to be despised. The second is that the women stories of 2 Kgs 4,1-37 (concerning the oil, and the raising of the son) appear, in some ways, as variations on the woman stories of 1 Kings 17⁽³¹⁾, in other words, as variations on the very text which Luke had already used at the beginning of chap. 7, especially in the Nain incident, 7,11-17. If Luke used the woman of 1 Kings 17 as a model for the woman of Nain (in the early part of chap. 7), then perhaps he used the related stories of 2 Kings 4 as a base for describing the sinful woman (at the end of chap. 7). In other words, Luke's sensitivity to 1 Kings 17 suggests that he may have been equally sensitive to the related episodes in 2 Kings 4. Again, little more than a straw in the wind, but again, not to be despised.

⁽³⁰⁾ T. L. BRODIE, "Towards Unraveling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7:11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17:17-24," *NTS*, forthcoming.

⁽³¹⁾ J. A. MONTGOMERY, for instance, (*The Book of Kings* [ICC; New York 1951] 366-367) speaks of parallelism and correspondences of detail between the texts. In comparison with 1 Kings 17, 2 Kgs 4,1-37 puts greater emphasis on the initiative and role of the woman.

Then, as the texts (2 Kgs 4,1-37; Luke 7,36-50) are examined more closely, a whole series of similarities begins to emerge. These similarities, however, are quite complex, and to grapple with them it is necessary to look at the texts more closely.

The OT text consists of two stories. The first (2 Kgs 4,1-7) tells of a widow who was in debt to the point of almost forfeiting her two sons to a creditor, and who, according to the LXX, had nothing left but a little oil for anointing herself. However, she called Elisha, and, by a process which involved the pouring out of the oil, she was freed from debt.

The second story (2 Kgs 4,8-37) is striking. It is delicately controlled and highly sophisticated. The woman is a woman of rank (*gynē megalē*). She is not indebted to anyone, nor does she ask anything of Elisha. Rather, it is she who endows him, providing him with hospitality (2 Kgs 4,8-10). Her husband, who is old, is a vague and ineffectual creature (see 2 Kgs 4,9-10.14.18-19.22-23). She has no children. When the prophet asks if there is anything he can do for her "she stood before him" and made a dignified and understated declaration of independence: "I live in the midst of my own people" (2 Kgs 4,13). The second time Elisha calls her, her resistance is palpable. She does not come before him. Instead, "she stood at the door" (2 Kgs 4,15). Even when Elisha promises her a child, her reaction, much as it betrays a hidden desire, still maintains a regal formality: "No, my lord, do not deceive your servant" (2 Kgs 4,16).

But the miracle happens, and when the boy dies the woman who once had stood at a distance from Elisha now seeks him out with a desperate determination. And when she finds him she throws herself at his feet, first in bitter entreaty, and later, after the boy is revived, in quiet thanksgiving.

The woman provides a powerful example of the deep transformation which had been effected by the prophet, and ultimately by God. Her body finds new life in the birth of her son. And her spirit finds new life in the realization that, however self-sufficient she may be, there is a God who grants more than she dare ask.

In different ways, therefore, both OT stories tell of women who, through Elisha, found new life. The first was released from a crushing debt; the second discovered a whole new richness in life.

The NT text (Luke 7,36-50) speaks first of a hospitable Pharisee, but then devotes most of its attention to the contrasting figure of a

sinful woman who threw herself at Jesus' feet, emotionally anointed them, and thereby found forgiveness and peace.

Literary analysts⁽³²⁾, while differing on details, have sometimes pointed out that there are two basic points at which the text seems to have been conflated or sewn together. First, there is the brief parable of the creditor and the two debtors (vv. 40-42), a parable which, because it puts forgiveness first (before love), is sometimes regarded as being at variance with the larger scene which seems to put love first — the woman's love for Jesus led to her being forgiven. Second, there are the concluding remarks by Jesus and the on-lookers, remarks largely concerned with forgiveness and Jesus' authority to forgive (vv. 47-50), most of which appear to have been added on, as a kind of commentary, to the picture of the Pharisee and the woman. But it has never been possible to explain what exactly lies behind these apparent divisions or seams.

Comparison of the two texts (2 Kgs 4,1-37; Luke 7,36-50), however, finally yields the following fundamental points:

The basic framework and raw material for Luke's overall text come from the story of the woman of Shunem (2 Kgs 4,8-37). Her contrasting characteristics (her initial standoffishness; her later humility and faith) have been transformed by Luke into two contrasting characters — the Pharisee and the sinful woman. The result of Luke's transformation is not to destroy the OT but to clarify it, to bring out in unforgettable images what the OT had suggested with subtlety.

The parable which to some degree seems to interrupt Luke's main text (the story of the creditor and two debtors, vv. 40-42), has little to do with the story of the Shunammite. It is drawn largely from the preceding story — that of the creditor who was claiming the two sons (2 Kgs 4,1-7).

The final verses, the commentary (vv. 47-50), have little to do with either OT story. They appear to be largely taken from some other source(s).

The essential point is that the basic divisions which have long been noticed in Luke's text correspond broadly to his fusing or con-

⁽³²⁾ E.g., see A. JÜLICHER, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (Freiburg 1899) II, 299-300; R. BULTMANN, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York-London 1963) 20-21; A. LOISY, *L'Évangile selon Luc* (Paris 1924) 235; SCHÜRMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 430, 434-435; FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 684.

flating of different sources — his conflating of the creditor story with the Shunammite story, and his conflating of both with some other final material.

To give a general idea of the interrelationship of the many parts of the two texts, it seems best to set them in outline. See following page.

From the outline (which simplifies somewhat, especially by the complete omission of Luke's final verses, 7,47-50), it may be seen that not all the elements of the OT creditor story (4,1-7) are used in the NT creditor story. The image of *an indebted woman pouring out anointing oil* has been, as it were, extricated or divided from the OT creditor story, and has been fused or conflated with the image of *the humble woman at the prophet's feet* — whence the complex picture of *a woman anointing Jesus' feet* (Luke 7,37-38). Furthermore, while the picture of Simon the Pharisee is modelled largely on the self-sufficient picture of the Shunammite, it is modelled also on Gehazi, the servant whose rather distant approach failed to spark life in the child. Thus, Luke's depicting of characters involves a rather complex process both of dividing and fusing: the Shunammite's contrasting characteristics have been divided into contrasting characters (one self-sufficient, the other humble), and each of these characters has been expanded through fusion with other characters (with the indebted woman, and with the detached servant).

To a modern historian such dividing and fusing of characters is not only far-fetched; it is abhorrent and bizarre. In the world of literary imitation, however, it was quite acceptable. As already mentioned, the source text was treated as raw material which could be wrestled or digested into a new form. Cicero at one point, when explaining the method of literary imitation, tells of an artist who, in order to produce one figure, drew on five models⁽³³⁾, and in Virgil's *Aeneid*, for instance, we find on several occasions that figures from Homer have not only been adapted to new situations but have also been fused together in various ways⁽³⁴⁾. Luke's procedure, therefore, bizarre though it may seem from one point of view, from another, artistic, viewpoint is quite legitimate. And from a pedagogical point

⁽³³⁾ *De inventione*, II, ii, 3-4.

⁽³⁴⁾ For a summary of some of the ways in which Homeric characters have been transformed and fused by Virgil, see G. N. KNAUER, *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Hypomnemata 7; Göttingen 1979) 342-343.

of view it is extremely purposeful. By dividing and fusing as he has done, Luke has rendered two stories, stories which involve considerable length and subtlety, into one single story which is concise and clear.

V. 2 Kgs 4,1-37 and Luke 7,36-50: Detailed Analysis

The following analysis goes through the OT text, section by section, (1, 2, 3, . . ., as in the outline), and compares each section with some section of Luke 7,36-50. The division of the text into such sections, however, involves some simplification. Luke does not always work in clearly separated sections, with one section of the OT being used in one section only of Luke's text. On the contrary, there is some criss-crossing of details. By and large, however, the sections do correspond.

2 Kings 4

Luke 7

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 An indebted woman contacts Elisha. She has only some anointing oil. (4,1-2)</p> <p>2 The indebtedness of the woman and her two sons is miraculously overcome (by the pouring of oil). (1-7)</p> <p>3 A woman of rank invites the prophet regularly to eat and recline in a room in her house. (8-11)</p> | <p>3 A Pharisee invites Jesus to eat and recline in his house. (7,36)</p> <p>1 A sinful woman knows of Jesus and comes with perfumed oil. (37)</p> <p>6a <i>Sin. . .</i>
The woman pours out her vitality, esp. through her head, at the feet of the prophet. (And she pours oil). (38)</p> |
| <p>4 The hospitable woman stays within her own world and does not appreciate the power of the prophet. (12-16)</p> | <p>4 The hospitable Pharisee stays within his own thoughts and does not appreciate Jesus' role as prophet. (39)</p> |

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| | 2 | Apropos the sinful woman Jesus tells of two people whose debts were gratuitously cancelled. (40-42) |
| 5 | The woman conceives (17) | 5 Simon comes to a better conception of things. (43) |
| 6a | <i>Death...</i>
Suffering from its head the child gives up its life on the woman's knees... And she falls at the prophet's feet. (18-28) | |
| 6b | <i>... And restoration</i>
Gehazi's detached approach fails. Through contact of mouth, eyes and hands life is restored and the woman falls at Elisha's feet. (29-37) | 6b <i>... And forgiveness</i>
Simon's approach is insufficient. The woman's tears, kisses and anointing restore her to forgiveness at Jesus' feet. (44-46) |

1. *The indebted woman (2 Kgs 4,1-2; Luke 7,37)*

The indebted woman who appeals to Elisha has only some anointing oil. And the sinful woman who comes to Jesus brings perfumed anointing oil.

Luke's text shows three basic adaptations. First, the woman's impoverishment is not financial but moral, internal. She is "a sinner", ἁμαρτωλός, a designation which not only reflects Luke's general concern for sinners, but reflects particularly the statement, made just a few verses earlier (Luke 7,34), that the Son of Man is a friend of sinners. Thus, on the one hand Luke is following the OT text, but on the other he is adapting it boldly to his own concerns and to the requirements of his own narrative coherence.

Second, while the anointing material in the LXX is quite modest ("some oil with which I shall anoint myself"), the NT anointing material is lavish — an alabaster vase of perfumed oil. Once again, what Luke has done is adapt the OT text to his own narrative, to the fact that in his account the woman's bankruptcy is not financial but moral. In other words, he keeps the basic element of anointing material but adapts it to a form more suited to the sinful woman. For lavish perfume may indeed connote a richness of love, but in

the possession of a well-known sinner it may also suggest a questionable luxuriousness⁽³⁵⁾.

Third, while Luke maintains the two basic OT elements, (the indebted woman and the anointing material), the narrative line is stripped to its barest essence. Instead of giving all the details dealing with the recent loss of her husband and the impending loss of her two sons, Luke concentrates on the core of the narrative: the woman's appeal to the prophet. In fact, in Luke's text there is no initial conversation with the woman, none at all. But even though Luke's version is supremely spare, his wording nonetheless carries echoes of the longer OT text. The OT woman calls Elisha because he "knows that" her family situation was such and such, and she tells him she has nothing "in the house" but anointing oil. The NT woman also is linked by knowledge to Jesus. She "knows that" he is "in the house" and she brings material for anointing. These verbal echoes may be laid out thus:

OT: καὶ γυνή... καὶ σὺ ἔγνωνς ὅτι... ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ

NT: καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνή... καὶ ἐπιγνοῦσα ὅτι... ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ

Thus, Luke's words reflect the OT but the exact context in which he uses these words is so different that we are faced not with a quotation of any kind, but apparently with some form of word-play. Such verbal similarity could possibly be coincidence, but if the phenomenon occurs several times, then it will have to be taken more seriously.

Overall, therefore, it is found that most elements of the OT picture of the indebted woman are found in adapted or abbreviated form in Luke.

2. *The two who were freed from debt (4,1-7: Luke 7,40-42)*

While the image of the indebted woman is transformed into that of the sinner, the image of the two indebted sons is transformed into that of the two contrasting debtors ("Which of them will love him

⁽³⁵⁾ It has been suggested that the action of the woman may indicate, among other things, that the perfume had been bought with ill-gotten money: J. D. M. DERRETT, *Law in the New Testament* (London 1970) 268.

more?") — a transformation which builds contrast and focusses attention on the internal disposition of the two.

Though Luke's processes of internalization and abbreviation involve a change in the form of the text and in the story line, his final text again echoes the wording of the LXX: δανιστής "creditor," a hapax in the NT, is found only four times in the LXX, only once in the narrative books of the LXX — in 2 Kgs 4,1. Nowhere else save in Luke 7,41 and 2 Kgs 4,1 is the creditor involved with "two" people. And the word "to pay," ἀποδοῦναι, in Luke 7,42, echoes ἀπόδου in 2 Kgs 4,7, but is used in a rather different way.

Furthermore, there is the verbal resemblance of the initial conversations. Each of the two OT stories contains an initial conversation between the prophet and the woman (vv. 1-4 and 12-16). The essence of each conversation is that the prophet asks what he can do for the woman, or offers to do something for her (vv. 2.13.14). In Luke's text, these conversations do not occur where one might expect them — in the initial presentation of the sinful woman and of the Pharisee. But in the Lukan story of the creditor there is an initial conversation with the Pharisee, a conversation in which Jesus offers, not to do something, but to say something. This conversation has apparent verbal and/or structural echoes of both OT conversations. Compare:

OT (vv 1-3): δανιστής... δύο... καὶ εἶπεν... τί ποιήσω σοι; τί ἐστὶν σοι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ... εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτήν

NT: εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν... ἔχω σοί τι εἰπεῖν... δύο... δανιστῇ

OT (vv 8-16): Σουμαν... Σωμανεῖτην... εἶπεν... πρὸς αὐτήν... τί δεῖ ποιησαί σοι... ἐν μέσῳ... ἐγώ... οἶκῳ... τί δεῖ ποιῆσαι αὐτῇ... ἡ δὲ εἶπεν Μή, κύριέ μου, μὴ διαψεύσῃ τὴν δούλην σου

NT: εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν, Σίμων, ἔχω σοί τι εἰπεῖν. ὁ δέ, Διδάσκαλε εἰπέ...

It does not seem possible, at least in the present state of research, to form a firm judgement concerning many of the details of these similarities. What is to be said, for instance, concerning the similarity of Σίμων to Σουμαν – Σωμανεῖτην? And of Διδάσκαλε to Κύριέ μου... διαψεύσῃ... δούλην? How far may word-play go⁽³⁶⁾? But

⁽³⁶⁾ In the OT, word-play is quite common. Among the rabbis some forms of word-play were used in a way that to us seems "very artificial and

whatever we may say about the details, it seems reasonable, given the general similarities between the conversations, and given the general acceptability, in Luke and in other authors, of the practice of fusing or conflating⁽³⁷⁾, to note that Jesus' initial conversation with Simon is significantly similar to Elisha's initial conversations with the OT women.

3. *The distinguished host invites a prophet (4,8-11; Luke 7,36)*

The second OT story begins by telling how a woman of rank invited Elisha regularly to eat and rest in her house. Luke tells how a Pharisee invited Jesus to eat with him and that Jesus went in and reclined. Unlike the rather elaborate OT narrative, Luke's text is brief and clear, yet its wording has significant similarities with the OT wording. Compare:

OT: ἐκράτησεν αὐτὸν φαγεῖν... ἐξέκλινεν... φαγεῖν... κλίνην...
ἐκκλινεῖ... καὶ εἰσῆλθεν... ἐξέκλινεν... ἐκοιμήθη
NT: ἡρώτα... αὐτὸν... ἵνα φάγῃ... καὶ εἰσελθὼν... κατεκλίθη

4. *The host's narrow world and narrow perception (4,12-16; Luke 7,39)*

Despite her apparent outgoing hospitality the woman of Shunem tends to stay within a rather circumscribed world, living, as she puts it, within her own people. And when the Pharisee who has called Jesus sees the wondrous encounter between the sinful woman and the prophet, his reaction is not one of receptivity but of confinement within his own narrow thoughts: "He said in himself..." Thus, both hosts, despite their openness at one level, seem quite closed at another. They live in their self-sufficient worlds. But again, Luke has

far-fetched"; see S. LIEBERMAN, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York 1962) 68-77, esp. 68.

(37) Thus where Euripides speaks of Hippolytus' father as cursing and of Hippolytus and his friends as crying (*Hippolytus*, vi, 1166-1183) Seneca gives a fused image, greatly compressed and starkly dramatic, of Hippolytus alone as cursing and crying (*Phaedra*, iv, 1004-1005). For further examples, see BRODIE, "Greco-Roman Imitation".

internalized his source: instead of a picture of economic and social self-sufficiency (living within one's own people), he gives a picture of a self-sufficiency which is more internal (living within one's own thoughts).

Apart from internalizing Luke also greatly compresses the narrative. Yet despite these changes he manages, by a kind of work-juggling, to keep a continuity with his source:

OT: καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν... ἡ δὲ εἶπεν Ἐν μέσῳ...

NT: ὁ καλέσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ...

As well as being confined within rather narrow worlds, the two hosts are hampered by a rather narrow perception of the prophet. The woman does not realize that he can bring her childless body to new life. And the Pharisee does not realize that Jesus is bringing new life to the sinful woman. In other words, both the Shunammite and Simon focus on what is negative (the apparently lifeless body; the apparently lifeless soul), and do not appreciate the positive power of the prophet. The Shunammite senses deception: "No, my lord, do not lie to your servant." The Pharisee doubts that Jesus is really a prophet.

5. *The host comes to a new conception (4,17; Luke 7,43)*

But the woman conceived (ἔλαβεν) and bore a son. And the Pharisee came to have some conception of the wonder of love and forgiveness: "I suppose (ὑπολαμβάνω) the one to whom he graciously forgave more." Here, too, there is a radical internalization. Both the woman and the Pharisee break out of their confined world and, through the prophetic word, come to a new conception, but while one conception is physical, the other is of a more internal kind. And here, too, through a form of word play (λαμβάνω/ὑπολαμβάνω), Luke manages to echo the OT wording.

6. *The outpouring and the restoration (4,18-37; Luke 7,38.44-46)*

The remainder of the OT text consists of two balancing sections — one dealing with the boy's dying (vv. 18-28), the other with his restoration (vv. 29-37) — and just as it was necessary to take in con-

junction the two OT initial conversations between Elisha and the women, so now, though in a somewhat different way, these two sections have to be taken together.

The balance or complementarity of the two OT sections may be seen in a number of basic features. First, there is the emphasis on the head and on bodily contact. The death began when the child complained about his head ("My head, my head"), and then he lay on his mother's knees till midday (καὶ ἐκοιμήθη ἐπὶ... ἕως) and died (vv. 19-20). The restoration to life occurred when Elisha lay on the child up to seven times (καὶ ἐκοιμήθη ἐπὶ... ἕως) and touched it on the head ("he put his mouth upon his mouth, and his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands," vv. 34-35). Furthermore, both sections emphasize the prophet's reclining place or couch. Just as the account of the dying tells how the woman took the dead child, laid it on the prophet's couch, shut the door and went out (v. 21), so the restoration account, using very similar wording, tells that Elisha went in, saw the child laid out on his couch, and shut the door (vv. 32-33). Both accounts tell also of an urgent journey, full of non-stop intensity and of imperatives not to pause: after the death there is the journey of the woman to the prophet (vv. 22-26), and before the restoration there is the breathless journey of Gehazi for what proves to be a futile attempt to try to raise the child (vv. 29-31). (Gehazi did not touch the child. He simply laid a staff on his face). Finally, both accounts conclude with the surprising image of the woman throwing herself at the feet of the prophet.

Apart from the urgent journey — a factor to be dealt with briefly later — the main elements of the two parts may be summarized thus:

The Death (vv. 18-28)

- "My head, my head"... and he lay on her knees till midday, and he died.
- She took him, laid him on the prophet's couch and shut the door.
- She went to Elisha and threw herself at his feet.

The Restoration (vv. 29-37)

(Gehazi's failed attempt)

- Elisha saw him laid out on his couch and he shut the door.

- He lay on the child... mouth to mouth... eyes to eyes... hands to hands... up to seven times... and the child revived.

- The woman went in and threw herself at Elisha's feet.

Luke's treatment of this two-fold OT material is quite complex. First of all, he keeps the basic structure, i.e., two scenes, the second of which is some kind of variation on or complement of the first, and so instead of balancing scenes of death and restoration, we find balancing scenes emphasizing sin (Luke 7,38; cf. vv. 37-39) and forgiveness (Luke 7,44-46; cf. vv. 42-47). He also keeps, as a distinctive feature of the second scene, the element of failure: Gehazi failed to spark life (2 Kgs 4,31), and Simon, too, failed to produce a kind of life (Luke 7,44-46). (We will return to this question of the failure.) But with regard to the details which are particular to each of the two OT scenes, these he does not keep distinct. Rather, he fuses details of both scenes together so that these details are found in *each* of the two NT scenes.

We begin by looking at Luke 7,38 — the first account of the woman at the feet of Jesus. In some ways it is like a synthesis of the various processes surrounding the death of the child.

2 Kgs 4,18-28:

- From its head the child gives up its life on its mother's knees.

- The woman lays the child on the prophet's reclining place.

- The woman throws herself at the feet of the prophet.

Luke 7,38:

- From her head (tears, hair, kisses) (and with her hands) the woman pours out her vitality at the feet of the prophet.

It may be seen through careful comparison that Luke's initial description of the woman involves both an internalization (because it stresses a kind of moral dying rather than a physical dying) and a fusing of the elements from the OT death scene. But it also contains details from the second OT scene, that of the restoration: the tears, kisses and implicit use of hands (for anointing) involve an exact transmutation of the emphasis which the OT restoration account puts on the eyes, mouth and hands. Furthermore, as already indicated, insofar as it includes the use of anointing oil, it fuses and transmutes an element from the earlier story (2 Kgs 4,1-2). Thus, the first scene of the woman at Jesus' feet is a dense but precise conflation of many elements from different sources.

And the second scene is largely a variation on the first. It mentions the same diversity of elements. Yet it is quite distinct from the first, not just because it emphasizes forgiveness rather than sinfulness, but also because it includes a sustained contrast with Simon: he gave no water, but she washed with her tears; he gave no kiss, but she did not cease to kiss; he did not even freshen Jesus' face with oil (a fairly common custom)⁽³⁸⁾, but she anointed his feet — with perfumed oil. As already indicated, this failure on the part of Simon corresponds to Gehazi's failure to arouse any spark of life in the child. It is probably not an accident that both failures, both descriptions of lifelessness, are described through a triple negative (οὐκ... οὐκ... οὐκ, 2 Kgs 4,31; Luke 7,44-46), but while the OT puts all three negatives together (there was neither sound, nor sign... and the child did not awake), Luke interweaves them clearly and powerfully into the different elements of his text (you did not... but she; you did not... but she; you did not... but she) and thus achieves a contrast which is more dramatic and sustained.

This increased sense of contrast, this greater clarity, coincides with the phenomenon noted earlier — the clear contrast which is achieved by changing the Shunammite's two characteristics into two characters. It also coincides with the aim of dramatic clarity which may be observed elsewhere, both in Luke⁽³⁹⁾ and in other writers⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Overall, therefore, Luke's balancing scenes of sin-and-forgiveness involve a complex and precise reworking of the OT scenes of death-and-restoration.

Some additional details concerning verbal similarities may be noted. The initial designation of the woman as standing (στᾷσα) at Jesus' feet as he reclined (v. 38), coincides with the initial description, carefully repeated, of the Shunammite as standing in Elisha's presence in his reclining room (ἔστη... ἔστη, vv. 12.15). It is difficult to say whether the repeated references to "this Shunammite" (τὴν Σωμανεῖτην ταύτην, vv. 12.36) and the phrase "Behold that Shunammite" Ἰδοὺ δὴ ἡ Σωμανεῖτις ἐκείνη, v. 25) are in any way

⁽³⁸⁾ See FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 691; Matt 6,17; Str-B, 1.426-428.

⁽³⁹⁾ See BRODIE, "Luke 7:11-17 as an *Imitatio*".

⁽⁴⁰⁾ On the relation of Luke's method of dramatization and compression to that of other writers, esp. Livy, see PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*, 111-136.

reflected in “You see this woman” (Βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα, Luke 7,44). Other similarities, some of which have already been suggested, may be summarised as follows:

- OT: τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (repeated, vv. 27.37)... εἰσῆλθεν... εἰς τὴν οἶκον (repeated, vv. 32-33)... οὐκ... οὐκ... οὐκ (v. 31)
 NT: τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (repeated, vv. 38.44-46)... εἰσελθὼν/εἰσῆλθον... εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν (repeated, vv. 36.44)... οὐκ... οὐκ... οὐκ (vv. 44-46)

Whatever our judgement on some of these details, the overall number of links between the texts is quite remarkable.

Turning finally to Luke’s concluding verses (vv. 47-50, “And so, I say to you, her sins... Go in peace”), we find, as already mentioned, that there is no dependence on 2 Kgs 4,1-37. However, Luke’s use of the fairly common OT dismissal form “Go in peace” is probably occasioned to some degree by the repeated references in 2 Kgs 4,22-26 to the woman’s going or journeying amid greetings of peace or well-being. Compare:

- OT: πορεύση... εἰρήνη... πορεύου... πορεύση... εἰρήνη... εἰρήνη... εἰρήνη... εἰρήνη
 NT: πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην

In other words, through the use of the well-known form Luke synthesizes and transforms a rather complex OT passage.

VI. Assessment of Method and Data

In literary studies in general there is no single established method for dealing with complex literary relationships. It is partly because of this lack of a clear method that much remains to be discovered about the use of sources⁽⁴¹⁾. Even so central and obvious a question as Milton’s use of Homer and Virgil needs significant development⁽⁴²⁾.

⁽⁴¹⁾ As G. HIGHET notes in his survey of the influence of the classics on later literature (*The Classical Tradition* [New York-London 1949] viii): “A great deal of the territory is still quite unexplored”.

⁽⁴²⁾ See F. C. BLESSINGTON, *Paradise Lost and the Classical Epic* (Boston-London 1979), esp. xi.

In NT literary studies the situation is somewhat worse. Not only is there an absence of a good method, but, to some degree, there is the presence of a method that is bad or at least inadequate. The use of the gospel synopsis — which is, of course, in itself, an indispensable aid — has tended to establish a method of comparing texts on the basis of something very simple — obvious verbal parallelism. Little or no effort is made to relate texts on the basis of the complex methods of transformation current in the first century. The result is that if two passages do not show fairly obvious parallelism they are either not compared, or their complex relationship, instead of being set in a literary context, is usually accounted for on the basis of evidence which is missing and uncontrollable — oral traditions and lost documents. Such lost traditions and documents may not be easily discounted, but to appeal to them too readily is to bypass the possibility of complex literary dependence.

The difficulty of seeing the relationship between two texts, one of which involves a complex reshaping of the other, may be seen, for instance, as Seneca suggests⁽⁴³⁾, in the case of a parent and its offspring. The offspring may be a very independent individual, and very different from the parent in many ways. A twenty-five-year-old woman may be very independent of and dissimilar from her sixty-year-old father. Yet she is composed, among other things, of what may be called a complex reworking of her father. If for some reason there is some doubt about whether the two are related, it is not sufficient simply to point to the many dissimilarities between them. The question rather is whether there are sufficient similarities to link the two. Are there, for instance, certain traits or marks, certain facial or bodily expressions which almost definitely point to some relationship? Are there external circumstances or details which confirm these indications?

Similarly, with regard to the way in which the NT involves a reworking of the OT. Bultmann, for instance, when comparing the shepherd theme in John 10 with that found in Ezekiel 34 asks if there is some form of dependence between them and says no. The dissimilarities are too great. Yet, as R. E. Brown points out⁽⁴⁴⁾, dissimilarities do not clinch the issue:

⁽⁴³⁾ *Ep. Mor.* 84.8.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ BROWN, *John I-XII*, 397-398.

To deny OT background because a new dimension or orientation has been given to OT ideas and symbols is to fail to understand Jesus' relation to the OT. Therefore the question must not be whether Jesus' symbolism is exactly the same as that of Ezekiel or of other parts of the OT, but whether there is enough similarity to suggest that the OT supplied the raw material for his creative reinterpretation and the continuation of that reinterpretation in the preaching of the apostles.

Similarly, with regard to 2 Kgs 4,1-37 and Luke 7,36-50. It is not sufficient to point to dissimilarities, even great dissimilarities, between the two texts. The question rather is whether there are sufficient positive indications to say that the OT text provided much of the raw material for the NT passage. And it seems that there are.

First of all, there is a certain extrinsic likelihood. Not only does Luke appear to have imitated the OT in various ways, but by mentioning Elijah and Elisha as he does in the programmatic Nazareth speech (Luke 4,16-30), he seems to indicate that these great prophets were among his primary OT models. And the link with the Nazareth speech and the figures of the great prophets is rarely stronger than in Luke 7,1-8,3.

Second, there are the inherent similarities of the texts. The tone of both passages is markedly feminine. The themes also are significantly similar — variations on the basic idea of overcoming a crushing mixture of debt and death. More decisive however than these general similarities, are the correspondences of the many and varied actions. Virtually every element of the OT narrative is found in summarized or transformed shape in the NT passage. Even relatively rare elements — the creditor, the anointing oil, the emphasis on the place where the prophet reclined, the host's standoffishness, the woman's throwing herself at the prophet's feet, the emphasis on physical contact involving head, eyes, mouth and hands, the contrast or failure on the part of a third party — all of these elements find an equivalent in Luke. And finally, at almost every stage, there are the curious verbal similarities. Many of them are small details but taken together they form a pattern and appear to confirm the existence of a persistent literary link.

Third, there is the consistency of the dissimilarities. They do not form some haphazard mixture, at odds with one another and with general literary practice. On the contrary, among themselves

they reflect coherent patterns, patterns of internalization, fusion, division, compression, and clarification. And these are precisely some of the fundamental procedures of rhetorical imitation. As for the basic variation in theme is concerned — an emphasis on sin and forgiveness rather than on death and life — this difference is quite consistent with Luke's general emphasis on the forgiveness of sinners and with his comparing of sin and forgiveness to death and life (Luke 15,32).

It seems reasonable, therefore, to conclude that Luke the Hellenistic writer did indeed imitate 2 Kgs 4,1-37. Through his careful artistry the ancient scripture has been modernized and clarified. But though the OT provides the narrative basis, it does not dictate the shape of Luke's text. On the contrary, it has been subjected to the overarching interests of a new theological vision. It has been developed and christianized. In a real sense, it has been fulfilled.

It does not, however, seem reasonable to say that the link between the texts is due to oral tradition. There is no known process of oral transmission which is capable of transforming a text in a way that is so complex and coherent⁽⁴⁵⁾. It is the literary explanation, and the literary explanation alone, which is capable of accounting for the data.

Luke's dependence on 2 Kgs 4,1-37 does not rule out the use of other sources. As already suggested, some aspects of Luke's text seem quite independent of the OT passage. This is true both of the harmless sensuousness of the woman's actions (vv. 37-38,44-46) and the theological explicitness of some of Luke's vocabulary (sinner, forgive, love, vv. 37,39,42-43). But it is particularly true of those final verses (47-50) which constitute a kind of commentary on the whole scene. However, whether it is possible to trace the origin of these extra elements is not the concern of this study. It is a matter for further research.

Luke's use of Hellenistic methods of composition does not exclude his use of Jewish methods as well. The two were often inter-

⁽⁴⁵⁾ None of the categories of oral transmission proposed, for instance, by B. GERHARDSSON (*The Origins of the Gospel Traditions* [Philadelphia 1979] 14-22) are capable of explaining such a transformation. As W. J. ONG remarks (*Interfaces of the Word. Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture* [Ithaca-London 1977] 254): "Closer plotting requires writing".

woven⁽⁴⁶⁾ and Luke's apparent use of a certain form of word-play, for instance, coincides with the Jewish tradition of word-play. But it seems better that Luke's reworking of the OT should not be called a midrash. Though the term has sometimes been used about Luke's use of the OT in the infancy narrative, there is an increasing tendency to speak of midrash only in cases of explicit citation and interpretation. Increasingly, therefore, it has seemed better not to use the term to describe Luke 1-2⁽⁴⁷⁾, and for the same reason it seems better not to use it of Luke 7,36-50.

Luke's imitation of the OT does not rule out his inclusion of genuine history. On the available evidence it might be suggested, for instance, that Luke's particular way of reshaping the OT reflects the historical reality of Jesus' relationship with Pharisees and sinners. It does not appear possible, however, at least in the present state of research, to go beyond such suggestions. For the moment, it seems better to say of Luke 7,36-50, as Fitzmyer said of Luke 1-2, that "whatever historical matter has been preserved... has been assimilated... to other literary accounts"⁽⁴⁸⁾.

As for Luke's apparent inconsistency with regard to which comes first, love or forgiveness, this seems to be due, not to muddled thinking or to an inability to control sources, but to a sensitivity to the complexity of things, to an awareness that the two interact in subtle ways⁽⁴⁹⁾. It is slowly being realized that many of the apparent inconsistencies of biblical writers are symptoms, not of awkwardness, but of artistry⁽⁵⁰⁾, and given Luke's established reputation as "a consummate literary artist"⁽⁵¹⁾ it seems best to see the tension which he creates in his text, much as it reflects some variety in his sources, as a careful artistic expression of the complexity of reality.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ On the interaction of the two kinds of methods, see KURZ, "Hellenistic Rhetoric", 182.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ For discussion, etc., see FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 308-309.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 309.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ See DELOBEL "L'Onction", 416, 470-474; J. Dupont, "Le Pharisien et la pécheresse", *Communautés et Liturgies* 62 (1980) 260-268.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ See esp. R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York 1981).

⁽⁵¹⁾ See FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 92. It is a matter for further research to decide whether Luke's tense balancing of two complementary points of view should be related to the Lukan "law of duality" so emphasized by R. MORGENTHAUER, *Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis: Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas*, 2 vols. (Zurich 1949).

As a result of this investigation the rootedness of Luke's text in the ancient (canonical) scriptures is considerably enhanced. Here is not the place to investigate the implications of such rootedness but it does seem useful at least to raise a question: does this relationship to the OT mean that Luke's work, from the moment of its composition, before being officially designated canonical by the church, was already something more than an occasional document? Does it mean that it already had an inherent quality of canonicity?

In all this, no appeal has been made to the Bethany anointing (Mark 14,3-9; Matt 26,6-13; John 12,1-8), and it may seem perverse to pursue the veiled OT relationship while ignoring the obvious links of the Bethany texts. But the relationship to the OT provides an explanation of Luke's text, which, though partial, is quite conclusive, and the relationship to the Bethany texts does not. As far as Luke 7,36-50 is concerned, the Bethany texts, at first so inviting, do not yield results. They tend rather to distract from other possible avenues of research. It has seemed better, therefore, for the moment, to concentrate on Luke's relationship to the OT.

It may be argued, however, now that the OT text has been examined, that it is necessary to resume comparison with the Bethany texts. This indeed must be done. But not yet. The literary study of the NT, at least with regard to rhetoric, imitation and narrative analysis, is in its infancy. To attempt a literary comparison of four isolated gospel texts without first seeing what this fledgling literary science has to say about the gospels and gospel relationships in general would be premature. It would lead only to an inconclusive discussion about the synoptic problem, about the origin of John's gospel, and about oral tradition. It is necessary to wait.

VII. Summary of Main Results

There is considerable evidence not only that Luke generally imitated the LXX, but that the distinctively Lukan block which emphasizes the role of Jesus and John as prophets (Luke 7,1-8,3) is especially indebted to the OT account of Elijah and Elisha. In particular, detailed literary comparison indicates that almost every element of the OT stories of the woman in debt and of the woman who found new life (2 Kgs 4,1-37) may be found in abbreviated or transformed shape in Luke's account of the forgiving of the sinful woman.

(7,36-50). The major difference between the texts is that in Luke many actions and ideas, especially those of debt and new life, are more internal. The most reasonable explanation of the complex but coherent mixture of similarities and dissimilarities seems to be that Luke, as a Hellenistic writer, used the commonly accepted Hellenistic practice of rhetorical imitation, including the techniques of internalization, fusion and compression, to synthesize, clarify and christianize the OT passage.

The comparison of Luke 7,36-50 with the OT passage is considerably more conclusive than comparison with the other evangelists' account of a later anointing at Bethany. It appears better to postpone comparison with the Bethany accounts until developing literary studies have cast further light on basic questions about the nature of the gospels and their relationships to one another.

Box 1224
651 Prospect St.
New Haven, CT 06505
U.S.A.

Thomas L. BRODIE, O. P.

SOMMAIRE

Le récit lucanien du pardon de la pécheresse (7,36-50) s'inspire largement, bien que non exclusivement, du texte sur les deux femmes en 2 R 4,1-37, celle qui fut libérée de sa grande dette (v. 1-7) et la Shunamite, qui reçut le don énorme de la vie (v. 8-37). Luc christianise le texte de l'AT et le transforme, de sorte qu'il est nettement centré sur ce qui est intérieur. Ce qui rend d'abord plausible pareille dépendance: 1) Lc 7,36-50 ne semble pas dépendre de Marc; 2) probablement, Luc, écrivain helléniste, utilisait le procédé rhétorique qui consiste à imiter ou adapter des textes existants, spécialement des textes anciens; 3) il y a des affinités entre Luc et la LXX, en particulier avec les récits sur Élie et Élisée.

La confirmation vient des ressemblances de détail des textes, au point que les différences peuvent être expliquées par les techniques imitatives d'adaptation.

The Historical Present in Mark as a Text-Critical Criterion

At 151 places in the gospel of Mark the historical present occurs where one might have expected a past tense verb⁽¹⁾, a phenomenon which has evoked various explanations. For instance, it was formerly argued that an Aramaic original is responsible for the numerous historical presents in Mark⁽²⁾, but current Aramaic scholarship is not inclined to view the historical present as an Aramaism⁽³⁾. The more common opinion⁽⁴⁾ is that the historical present is used to produce a dramatic effect or to heighten the vividness of a narrative. In this connection Moulton⁽⁵⁾ concluded that the historical present was not normally used in educated conversation or in literature as a

(1) John C. HAWKINS, *Horae Synopticae* (2nd ed.; Oxford 1909) 144-148, using the Westcott-Hort text.

(2) W. C. ALLEN, "The Original Language of the Gospel According to St. Mark", *The Expositor*, 6th ser., I (1900) 436-443, carried this argument further in "The Aramaic Element in St. Mark", *ExpTim* XIII (1901-02) 328-330, and "The Aramaic Background of the Gospels", *Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (ed. W. Sanday; Oxford 1911) 295-299. See also J. WELLHAUSEN, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (2nd ed.; Berlin 1911) 17, and C. F. BURNEY, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford 1922) 87-90.

(3) M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3rd ed.; Oxford 1967) 130. E. P. SANDERS, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge 1969) 253, notes Allen's postulation to be a dead issue.

(4) E. DE WIJTT BURTON, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of New Testament Greek* (3rd ed.; Edinburgh 1898) 9; F. BLASS and A. DEBRUNNER, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (rev. & trans. R. W. Funk; Chicago 1961) 167; and W. W. GOODWIN, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (New York 1965) 11. Among commentators, see E. TROCMÉ, *La formation de l'Evangile selon Marc* (Paris 1963) 112, and T. A. BURKILL, *New Light on the Earliest Gospel* (Ithaca 1972) 185-186. This interpretation is popularized in the *New American Standard Bible*.

(5) J. H. MOULTON, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (3rd ed.; Edinburgh 1908) I, 120-121.

narrative form. Howard⁽⁶⁾, observing the 206 occurrences in Herodotus and 218 in Thucydides as compared with but 61 in Xenophon and 40 in Polybius, added that its use in Hellenistic Greek was largely vernacular. In concert with this observation, Kilpatrick⁽⁷⁾ detects in the high frequency of historical presents in Mark evidence that Mark was a non-literary writer writing as though involved in spontaneous conversation. Specifically Kilpatrick posits, "Thus non-literary *Koine* employed the historic present freely but literary *Koine* did not. On the other hand the historic present is quite common in Attic writers like Thucydides. In view of this we can assume that where our manuscripts vary between the present historic and a past tense, other things being equal, the present is likely to be original and the past tense a correction to literary *Koine*⁽⁸⁾".

Now in the Greek text issued in 1958 by the British and Foreign Bible Society⁽⁹⁾, which was the result of collaboration between Erwin Nestle and Kilpatrick, there is no indication that Kilpatrick's thesis was being followed, or that it had even been formulated at that time. In certain texts preference is given to the historical present.

- 2,8 λέγει κ B L 33 (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
εἶπεν A C D Γ Δ Θ Π unc⁹ *al fere omn* (TR)
- 4,1 συνάγεται κ B C L Δ 28 69 *al* (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
συνήχθη D Π unc⁹ *al pler* (TR)
συνήχθησαν A al¹⁰ goth arm eth
- 6,1 ἔρχεται κ B C L Δ Θ 982 (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
ἦλθεν A (D) Π unc⁹ *al pler* (TR)
- 6,45 ἀπολύει κ B D L Δ f¹ (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
ἀπολύσῃ P⁴⁵ A E² F G H M S U V W Π *al pler* (TR)
ἀπέλυσεν Θ 565 syr^s
- 8,6 παραγγέλλει κ B D L Δ (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
παρήγγειλε A C N W^c X Γ Π unc⁹ *al omn vid* (TR)
- 8,20 λέγουσιν κ B C L Δ (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS² TR)
εἶπον P⁴⁵ A D N W X Γ Θ Π unc⁹ *al fere omn goth arm*

⁽⁶⁾ J. H. MOULTON and W. F. HOWARD, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh 1929) II, 456-457.

⁽⁷⁾ G. D. KILPATRICK, "The Historic Present in the Gospels and Acts", *ZNW* 68 (1977) 258-262.

⁽⁸⁾ "The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the Textus Receptus", *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of G. H. C. Macgregor* (eds. H. ANDERSON and W. BARCLAY; Oxford 1965) 198.

⁽⁹⁾ *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ* (2nd ed.; London 1958).

- 11,7 ἐπιβάλλουσιν κ B C D L Δ 28 *al* (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
ἐπέβαλον A X Γ Π *unc*⁸ *al pler goth eth* (TR)
- 15,24 σταυροῦσιν B (L) Ψ 892 *it syr^{hmg} cop^{sa.bo} arm eth* (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
σταυρώσαντες κ A C D P X Γ Θ Π *unc*⁹ *al omn vid* (TR)

However, in certain other places where significant variation exists in the manuscript tradition, Kilpatrick opts for a past tense verb, *e.g.*,

- 8,21 ἔλεγεν κ A B C E G H L M S U V X Γ Δ *al pler* (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS² TR)
λέγει D F K Π *al plus*⁴⁰ *it*
- 8,29 ἐπρώτα κ B* C D L Δ 53 (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
λέγει A C^c N X Γ Π *al pler* (TR)
- 10,51 εἶπεν κ B C D L Δ Ψ *it^{ms} arm* (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
λέγει A K W X Γ Θ Π Σ *al pler* (TR)
- 11,28 ἔλεγον κ B C D L l 209 *goth* (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
λέγουσιν A D N X Γ Π *unc*⁹ *al pler vulg arm* (TR)
- 12,43 εἶπεν κ A B D K L Δ Π *al*⁴⁰ *it^{ak} cop^{sa.bo} eth* (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
ἔλεγεν 1542
λέγει E F G H M S V W X Γ Θ Σ 7 115 565 827 1038 1047
1082 1093 1216 1223 1355 1391 *al* (TR)
- 14,29 ἔφη *al omn*
εἶπεν 280 579
λέγει D Ψ
ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει W 565 1542
- 15,47 τέθειται κ^c A B C D L Δ Π 33 69 131 229 238 (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
τίθεται E G K M S U V Γ *al pler* (TR)

He is not inclined to accept an historical present into the text which has only minimal support, as in 4,11 ἔλεγεν/λέγει D 28; 4,21 ἔλεγεν/λέγει W 827 *al pauc*; 12,41 ἐθεώρει/θεωρεῖ κ* 273, and there are no instances in Mark in this edition in which an historical present is based upon a singular reading.

However, in the Greek text for translators⁽¹⁰⁾ which Kilpatrick edited in 1961 there are two striking phenomena with regard to the historical present in Mark. First, rather than gravitating toward the historical present, in the earlier part of the gospel Kilpatrick, in fact, *departs from* the historical present in several instances, *e.g.*,

⁽¹⁰⁾ G. D. KILPATRICK, ed., *A Greek-English Diglot* (London 1961).

- 2,16 ἦσθιεν ^{P⁸⁸} κ D 892 vulg eth (GED)
 ἐσθίει B L Θ 33 565 579 (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
 ἐσθίοντα A C W^c Γ Δ Π unc⁹ al pler (TR)
- 2,25 ἔλεγεν A B Γ Δ Π unc⁸ al pler (TR GED)
 λέγει κ C L W 13 28 33 69 124 892 1241 1424 (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
- 5,9 ἀποκρίθη λέγων E F G H S U V Π^{mg} al pler (TR GED)
 λέγει κ A B C K L M Δ Π^{xi} al plus²⁵ vulg (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)
- 5,23 παρεκάλει B W Δ Θ Π unc⁹ al pler vulg (TR GED WH^{mg})
 παρακαλεῖ κ A C L 33 (WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS²)

In 8,21.29 and 11,28, he retains the past tense in instances in which there is considerable manuscript support for the historical present. Second, however, in the latter part of the gospel Kilpatrick now *accepts* the historical present in instances of variation comparable to those in the earlier part of the gospel where he opted for the past tense, *e.g.*, 10,51; 12,43; 14,29 and 15,47. Four years later in the Macgregor *Festschrift*, in which he sets out his theory of the historical present as a matter of Markan style, Kilpatrick illustrates with 10,51 and 12,43, but of considerable importance for text-critical methodology is his preference for λέγουσιν at 12,16 with A 579 1342 it^{ms} vulg syr^s eth arm against εἶπον *al omni vid* (p.199). Here we encounter clear indication of the “rigorous eclecticism” which has come to be associated with Kilpatrick’s name, in which an author’s style becomes the determinative consideration in text-critical judgments. That Kilpatrick intended the historical present to be a pervasive factor in textual judgments in Mark is evident when, reflecting upon Hawkins’ count of 151 historical presents in Mark, he notes⁽¹¹⁾, “These figures should probably be increased as there are several passages where we should read a present where our texts give another tense.” Presumably this would involve accepting those historical presents in 2,16. 25; 5,9. 23, which in the *Greek-English Diglot* were neglected in favor of past tense verbs. The illustrations of 10,51 and 12,43 indicate that those in 8,21.29; 11,28, which have sizeable manuscript support, would now be included in the text as original. But are we to conclude from his preference for λέγουσιν at 12,16 that some 40 other texts in Mark where the historical present

⁽¹¹⁾ KILPATRICK, *ZNW* (1977) 258.

occurs with negligible manuscript support or as a singular reading should also be accepted as original upon the basis of "style"? This would, in fact, appear to be the import of Kilpatrick's maxim and would cohere fully with the direction he set out in the Schmid *Festschrift*⁽¹²⁾.

However, in view of the several critiques of the indiscriminate use of stylistic considerations in Metzger⁽¹³⁾, Fee⁽¹⁴⁾, and Epp⁽¹⁵⁾, it must be questioned whether and to what degree Mark's use of the historical present can serve usefully as a text-critical criterion.

I

Prior to undertaking an analysis of the historical presents in Mark, it is instructive to survey the use of this phenomenon in the wider scope of Greek literature. Initially it must be observed that it is commonly assumed that in using the present tense the narrator relates the story as if he were an eyewitness, or perhaps to convey to the reader the dramatic feeling of being an eyewitness⁽¹⁶⁾. However, while this is a fair assumption about the historical present in modern European languages, the historical present in the Greek of an earlier period possesses quite different properties, to which the common assumption fails to do justice⁽¹⁷⁾.

(12) KILPATRICK, "Atticism and the Text of the New Testament", *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid* (ed. J. Blinzler, et al; Regensburg 1963) 125-137.

(13) B. M. METZGER, *The Text of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Oxford 1968) 178-179.

(14) G. D. FEE, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism-Which?", *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick* (ed. J. K. Elliott; Leiden 1976) 174-197.

(15) E. J. EPP, "The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?", *HarvTR* 69 (1976) 211-257, esp. 254f.

(16) See E. SCHWYZER, *Griechische Grammatik* (München 1950) II, for references. See also fn. 4 *supra*.

(17) See C. WATKINS, "Preliminaries to a Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Syntax of the Old Irish Verb", *Celtica* 6 (1963) 1-49, and C. WOOD, "The so-called Historical Present in Old Norse", *Scandinavian Studies: Essays Presented to Dr. Henry Goddard Leach* (eds. C. Bayernschmidt and E. Friis; Seattle 1965) 105-110, for similar usage elsewhere in older forms of Indo-European speech.

Paul Kiparsky⁽¹⁸⁾, in a seminal essay on tense and mood in Indo-European syntax, has disclosed three chronological layers with respect to the historical present in Greek. 1) Beginning with the observation of the lack of the historical present in Homer⁽¹⁹⁾, Kiparsky posits that conjunction reduction (by which he means the various rules that factor out shared constituents in coordinate structures) was handled by injunctives⁽²⁰⁾, zero verb forms which neutralized both tense and mood. In Homer injunctives occur at places where in later Greek one tends to find the historical present. 2) In post-Homeric Greek the injunctive fell into disuse and its role as the unmarked tense and mood was taken over in narrative by the present indicative. Thus in Thucydides and Herodotus the historical present is a replacement of the moribund injunctive. 3) In the newest system, characteristic of modern English and German and already nascent in classical Latin⁽²¹⁾, the historical present is not used so much as a past tense, but more as a true present. In this recent usage one encounters the sustained sequences of historic presents common to modern English vernacular.

Actually the understanding of the historical present to which Kiparsky has given careful consideration had been suggested earlier by von Fritz⁽²²⁾, who analyzed the use of the historical present in Herodotus and Xenophon. In Herodotus I:8-15 occurs the interesting story of Kandaules, Rhodope, and Gyges. The entire episode of how Kandaules appealed to his friend Gyges to see his wife undress so as to see her full beauty, how Gyges then came to the palace and hid behind the door of her bedchamber, how the queen entered and began to undress, etc., is told in the aorist and imperfect, but at the dramatic moment when Gyges, after having seen the naked queen,

⁽¹⁸⁾ "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax", *FoundLang* 4 (1968) 30-57.

⁽¹⁹⁾ The lack of historical presents in Homer is commonly, but erroneously, attributed to epic style. See among others, H. KOLLER, "Praesens historicum und erzählendes Imperfekt", *MusHelv* 8 (1951) 88.

⁽²⁰⁾ Note the classic study of R. THURNEYSEN, "Der indogermanische Imperativ", *ZVglS* 27 (1883) 172-180.

⁽²¹⁾ See A. EMERY, *The Historical Present in Early Latin* (Ellsworth, Me. 1897).

⁽²²⁾ Kurt von FRITZ, "The So-called Historical Present in Early Greek", *Word* 5 (1949) 186-201.

tried to slip out of the bed-chamber unnoticed, there is one sentence in the historical present: καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐπορᾷ μιν ἐξίόντα. The remainder of the narrative then proceeds in the past tenses. Similarly in I:34-35 the story of Croessus' dream that his favored son Atys would be killed by an iron spear, his subsequent over-protection of Atys in keeping him from war, the announcement of a wild boar which terrorized the area, the boar hunt and Atys' desire to participate lest he be viewed as a coward, is all given in the aorist and imperfect. However, at the dramatic moment when Adrastus throws the spear, misses the boar and hits Atys, the sentence is in the historical present. The subsequent account of Croessus' anger toward the man sent to protect Atys who had actually wound up killing him, Adrastus' plea for mercy, Croessus' forgiveness, and Adrastus' suicide, continues in the past tenses. K. von Fritz observes (p. 196) that in these and similar instances in Herodotus the dramatic effect is not produced by a sequence of verbs in the present tense, but by placing one historical present in the midst of verbs in the aorist and imperfect. In this respect Herodotus' use of the historical present is obviously quite different from the "rambling" sequence encountered in modern vernacular. It is also clear that in this usage the historical present is "timeless," a zero usage as far as tense and mood are concerned⁽²³⁾.

K. von Fritz notes (p. 199) that a gradual weakening of this stylistic use of the historical present is observed, as the single present tense verbs surrounded by aorists in Plato no longer have the same dramatic effect as those encountered in Herodotus. In Plato's *Symposium* 217C, for instance, the narrative of Alcibiades in which he recounts the various attempts he made to attract the sexual attention of Socrates, each time with failure, is all told in past tense verbs. The turning point in the story occurs then, as Alcibiades sends an invitation to Socrates to join him in a meal: προκαλοῦμαι δὲ αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸ συνδειπνεῖν. Following this isolated use of the historical present, the remainder of the story treats the aftermath of the meal in which Socrates still attaches no sexual interest to Alcibiades and is told in the past tense. Now while von Fritz is correct in his observation that this use of the historical present does not involve a

⁽²³⁾ Note the still useful study of Karl RODEMEYER, *Das Praesens historicum bei Herodot und Thukydides* (Basel 1889) 70 pp.

dramatic effect, it must be noted that it does function semantically in the same way as it did in Herodotus, viz., it functions cataphorically to denote a semantic shift from one type of material to another. As such, it is not the statement which is in the present tense itself which is highlighted, so much as it denotes a turning point in the story.

When one turns to Xenophon's *Anabasis*, another use of the historical present occurs which differs somewhat from that in Herodotus. In *Anabasis* I.i.3-8; 10-11, and II.ii.1-2, for instance, the main events are told in the present tense, with subordinate and preparatory actions related in the past tense. Further, there is nothing particularly dramatic or vivid about these narratives. More importantly, where dramatic events do occur in *Anabasis* (as II.v.31-34), they are regularly put in the past rather than in the present tense. K. von Fritz (p. 191) agrees with the assessment of Wackernagel⁽²⁴⁾ that these presents in Xenophon are not true presents, but "timeless," and suggests correctly that Xenophon's use of the historical present is substantially divergent from the rambling historical present of modern European languages.

In particularly perceptive fashion, H. St. John Thackeray⁽²⁵⁾ observed in his 1920 Schweich Lectures that nearly two-thirds of the instances of the historical present in the LXX are to be found in the books of Samuel and Kings and that these uses are capable of closer definition than "dramatic." Thackeray posits that it functions "to introduce a date, a new scene, a new character, occasionally a new speaker; in other words a fresh paragraph in the narrative" (p. 21). He cites as examples of its role as "curtain-raiser," 1 Sam 1,19 and 3,15 in codex M, in which the historical present coincides with an old chapter-opening in that manuscript. 1 Sam 4 opens with the two armies encamped against one another, with the scene being depicted by four historical presents. The main action follows in past tenses, the historical present surfacing only at significant turning points in the narrative, such as the entry of the ark on the scene (v.4), the defeat (v.10), and the death of the wife of Phinehas which

(24) J. WACKERNAGEL, *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Latein, und Deutsch* (Basel 1920) I, 162 ff.

(25) *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (London 1921) 20-22.

came about as the result of the news (v.20). In chapters 5-7 which follow, the historical presents mark the stages in the itinerary of the ark and the various incidents in those connections.

In the Goliath episode (chap. 17), another *mise en scène* occurs with eight historical presents in the first three verses, cataphorically setting the stage for the following account. What Thackeray did not observe, however, is the cataphoric function of the historical present in the remainder of the account. The episode itself (17,4-18,5)⁽²⁶⁾, in which Goliath intimidated Israel, David evidenced no fear, Saul selected David to fight Goliath and armed him with his own armor, sword, and helmet, is all in the aorist and imperfect. At the moment when David discards the armament, however, the historical present is used. Then the story resumes in past tense verbs, recounting the dramatic encounter with Goliath. Even the vivid description of the death and beheading of Goliath are in the past tense. In v.52, however, at the death of Goliath, an historical present occurs denoting the "springing into action of the Israelites," yet the following account of the momentous rout of the Philistine army is told in the past tense. Obviously, as in Plato and Xenophon, it is not "dramatic" action which is inherent within the statements in the historical present. They merely function here, as elsewhere, cataphorically to denote major semantic shifts to material of a different nature. That is to say, the fact that in v.39 David takes off the armor is not highlighted, but that statement, marked by the historical present, denotes a semantic shift from the selection of David to the matter of actual combat. Similarly, the "rising up" of the Israelites in v.52 is not prominent in itself, but marked by the historical present, it denotes a shift from the David-Goliath encounter to the rout of the Philistines.

Thackeray, reflecting upon the use of the idiom in the LXX, noted (p. 22), "I can only remark in passing that the presents in St. Mark (λέγει excluded) are used in a precisely similar way to introduce new scenes and characters, that they generally coincide with chapter-openings in the capitulary system in Codex Alexandrinus,

⁽²⁶⁾ Vv.12-31; 17,55-18,5 are missing in Vaticanus. See H.J. STOEBE, "Die Goliathperikope I Sam. 17.1-18.5 und die Textform der Septuaginta", VT 6 (1956) 197-213, but cf. H.W. HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel* (trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia 1976) 146-147.

and that St. Luke, in suppressing them, has removed a feature which to the observant reader serves to divide the older Gospel into rough paragraphs".

This cursory survey has elicited three principal uses of the historical present in literature prior to the NT, aside from the tabular use in the Paros inscription of 263 B.C.⁽²⁷⁾: 1) the apparent highlighting in older Greek literature of the principal aspect of a narrative by isolating the historical present in the midst of past tense verbs, 2) the cataphoric use of the historical present to denote a semantic shift from one type of material to another, and 3) the recounting of the main events in a narrative with the historical present, placing preparatory and subordinate actions, as well as truly dramatic events, in the past tense (as *Anabasis* I:3-6a; I:10; II:1).

II

Granting the point made by Kiparsky⁽²⁸⁾, Reynolds⁽²⁹⁾ argues correctly against the common assumption of "vividness" in Mark's use of the historical present, maintaining that if the narrator intended vividness by the historical present, there is no explanation for why he frequently "breaks the illusion" by introducing a past tense. Since the historical present does have obvious discourse function, as Thackeray has proposed, and clearly functions syntactically and semantically as a past tense, in line with Kiparsky's view, one is led to question whether it is not comparative frequency or infrequency, but precise manner of usage which is the real matter of interest to textual criticism. If Mark's use of the historical present is not mere vernacularism, how is his use to be understood? And what value has it for textual criticism?

It may be suggested that Mark's use of the historical present is not different from that in Plato, Xenophon, and LXX. His uses may be summarized as follows:

⁽²⁷⁾ See VON FRITZ, *Word* (1949) 190.

⁽²⁸⁾ See also S. LEVIN, "Remarks on the 'Historical' Present and Comparable Phenomena of Syntax," *FoundLang* 5 (1969) 386-390.

⁽²⁹⁾ S. REYNOLDS, "The Zero Tense in Greek," *WestTJ* 32 (1969) 68-72.

1) The cataphoric⁽³⁰⁾ use of isolated historical presents within units dominated by past tense verbs to denote a semantic shift within the account to material of somewhat different nature is a frequent occurrence in Mark as in earlier Greek literature (e.g., Plato, *Symposium* 217C; Xenophon, *Anabasis* I:9; II:4-5a). In no less than eighteen passages the episode is introduced with past tenses and the account unfolds in past tenses, interrupted by the historical present which signals a significant shift in the narrative, followed in turn by the conclusion of the account in past tense verbs. Further, in some fifteen other passages the episode is introduced by past tenses, but followed immediately by the historical present in close relationship to the stage-setting past tense, with the prefatory material in the past tense, interrupted in the discourse by the historical present signalling a major shift to another aspect of the story which follows in past tenses. In fact, of all the historical presents in Mark, only five texts are clearly not cataphoric: 2,17; 3,33.34; 10,11.42; 11,22.

Exemplary of this cataphoric use is 1,29-34 in which the story of the leaving of the synagogue and arrival at the house of Peter, where Peter's mother-in-law lay sick with a fever, is given in the past tense. λέγουσιν in v.30 signals the shift from background matters to the principal action, which is the actual curing of the woman,

(30) S. LEVINSOHN, "Preliminary Observations on the Use of the Historic Present in Mark", *Notes on Translation* 65 (1977) 13-28, following Thackeray's suggestion, observes the cataphoric use of the historical present in Mk 14-16, which is generally true of 1-13 also with the exceptions of 2,17; 3,33.34; 10,11; and 11,22. However, there are major problems with his assertion that, "The overall effect of employing the historic present in Mark is to give prominence within the Gospel to certain themes, so that, although the Gospel is cast in a narrative development type, Mark's intention in recounting the events may be discerned clearly." For instance, L. E. KECK, "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel", *NTS* 12 (1966) 352-370, has identified several prominent motifs in the Markan prologue which are not given prominence in the gospel by the use of the historic present. Further, the prominent paragraph 1,16-20, in which the theme of "discipleship", which is to dominate not only 1,21-3,12 but also the entire gospel, is devoid of historical presents. Additionally, Levinsohn's theory does not explain the absence of the historical present in 3,7-12; 5,24b-34; 6,14-29.53-56; 9,30-32.38-50; 10,13-22.32-34; 11,12-14; 12,1-12.28-49; 14,1-11.22-26, nor why these episodes are "subordinate" to Mark's literary purpose. Clearly the literary structure of Mark must be determined upon some basis other than the use of the historical present.

given as usual in the past tense. Also, in 7,31-37 the geographical setting is given in the past tense, followed immediately by the historical present introducing the deaf and dumb man in v.32. Once introduced, the prefatory making of spittle, etc., by Jesus is past tense. Λέγει, then, in v.34 signals the semantic shift to the actual healing of the man in vv.35-37, all of which is told in the past tense. In this literary format, λέγω occurs frequently (thus providing an answer for Thackeray's troublesome λέγει), but one finds other verbs as well, such as φωνοῦσιν (10,49) which marks the turning point in the healing of blind Bartimaeus and ἐπισυντρέχει (9,25) which functions similarly in the healing of a boy with an unclean spirit.

This particular use of the historical present is erroneously posited by Synge⁽³¹⁾ to be an alien tense inserted into the text by an annotator to advertise his work as his own and to "avoid claiming for his own contribution the authority and prestige of the original narrative and to avoid tampering with the text". This, however, is to overlook one of the principal uses of the historical present in Mark. The cataphoric use of the historical present in isolation in the midst of a series of past tense verbs to denote a semantic shift to different material within the unit of text occurs well over thirty times in Mark, a usage of some importance for text-critical judgments. For instance, in 4,1-34 the parable of the sower and discussion of the purpose of parables is given in the past tense, but λέγει in v.13 signals the prominence of vv.13-20 (all in past tense verbs) in which the parable is explained to the disciples. Now in the following section, which is regularly dominated by past tense verbs, at v.21 λέγει is read by W 827 *al pauc* for ἔλεγεν and the same is true of 267 *al pauc* at v.24, and at v.33 λαλεῖ is read by 700 for ἐλάλει. Kilpatrick's maxim would suggest the probability of the historical present being original in each instance, but *actual* Markan style favors the imperfect at all three locations along with the apparently solid imperfects at vv.26.30.

On the other hand, Markan style would tend to support the historical present παραγγέλλει (with * B D L Δ and WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS² GED) against παρήγγειλε (A C N W^c X Γ Π unc⁹ *al omn vid*) at 8,6a, since in the feeding of the four-thousand the preparatory

⁽³¹⁾ F. C. SYNGE, "A Matter of Tenses-Fingerprints of an Annotator in Mark", *ExpTim* 88 (1977) 170.

action in 8,2-5 is in past tense verbs and παραγγέλλει serves well to denote the semantic shift to the actual feeding which begins in v.6b, recounted in the past tense as is regularly done.

2) As in LXX, Mark uses the historical present to set the stage for an event, with the account itself given entirely in past tense verbs, e.g., 1,21; 3,13.20; 8,22; 11,15; 12,18, and with the historical present in conjunction with past tenses at the beginning of an account, 2,18; 4,1; 7,1.5. On the other hand, there are some fifteen instances in Mark with no historical present at all (1,1-8.16-20; 3,7-12; 5,24b-34; 6,14-29.53-56; 9,30-32.38-50; 10,13-22.32-34; 11,12-14; 12,1-12.28-49; 14,1-11.22-26). It is not clear whether at 6,1 the rejection at Nazareth begins with ἔρχεται (with * B C L Δ Θ and WH NA²⁶ UBS² BFBS² GED) or ἦλθεν (A Π unc⁹ *al pler* and TR), although ἀκολουθοῦσιν immediately following is preferable to ἠκολούθησαν (827 1574) and would place the account with 2,18 *et al* if not with 1,21 *et al*. The matter must be decided upon some basis other than "Markan style".

3) As in Xenophon, there are instances in which the historical present marks the main features of the discourse, culminating in each instance in past tense verbs. For instance, in 2,3-12 the healing of the paralytic is recounted principally with historical presents, concluding in v.12 with the actual healing and departure of the paralytic in the aorist. Similarly in 4,35-41 the calming of a storm is told in the historical present, but with the actual stifling of the wind and amazement of the disciples given at the end in the past tense. In 5,21-24a and 35-43 occurs the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter, given in the historical present with the actual raising in 42-43 in the past tense. Yet "sandwiched" between in vv.24b-34 is the account of the woman in the crowd who touched Jesus' garment, told in its entirety in the past tense as subordinate to the main episode. The account of the triumphal entry in 11,1-11 is in the historical present, yet concludes in vv.8-11 with the actual entry given in the past tense. Other uses in Mark of this sort are 14,12-21 (passover meal); 14,32-52 (Gethsemane); and 15,16-47, where the events leading up to and including the crucifixion are given in historical presents, but the actual death and burial of Jesus are in the past tense.

Two observations are pertinent in this regard. First, it is difficult to accept the proposal of Synge⁽³²⁾ that these culminating aorists are the annotations of an editor. Far from being intruders in a hos-

tile environment, they must, in view of the established literary usage under consideration, be viewed as original and integral to the account. Second, the suggestion of Kilpatrick that at 15,47 the historical present is to be preferred over the perfect τέθειται⁽³²⁾, is troublesome in that in terms of *actual* Markan style the tendency regularly to conclude with past tense verbs a narrative dominated by verbs in the historical present, suggests that here the perfect was original with Mark. Similarly, *true* Markan style would militate against accepting λέγει with α^c W vulg at 4,40, which would be original according to Kilpatrick's maxim, as vv.39-40 are entirely in the past tense as the dramatic conclusion to the calming of the storm episode, dominated by historical presents.

III

To conclude, what appears at first glance to be a useful text-critical criterion for assessing transcriptional probability at places in Mark where variation exists in the manuscript tradition between an historical present and a past tense verb is rendered unserviceable by considerations which make it difficult to assume Mark's use of the historical present to be a mere vernacularism. It is methodologically indefensible merely to assume in Mark a vernacularism similar to that in modern English based upon the ratio of occurrences between Herodotus and Thucydides on the one hand and Xenophon and Polybius on the other. As Metzger⁽³⁴⁾ has reminded us, Radermacher's warning against undue reliance upon statistical considerations in judging the literary style of an author must be honored. What we need to know about a given linguistic phenomenon is not merely its frequency, but its precise usage(s). Those usages must be determined by analyzing texts according to actual ancient usage and not by infusing into ancient texts usages from later eras and other contexts.

⁽³²⁾ SYNGE, *ExpTim* (1977) 168-171.

⁽³³⁾ KILPATRICK'S preference for τίθεται is in "Some Notes on Markan Usage", *BTrans* 7 (1956) 54-55.

⁽³⁴⁾ METZGER, *The Text of the New Testament*, 179, fn. 1, referring to Ludwig RADERMACHER, *Koine* (= *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-hist. K.*, CCXXIV, 5. Abhandlung, 1947) 61 ff.

Mark's use of the historical present is not merely a vernacularism. It functions syntactically and semantically as a past tense, or more accurately a "zero" tense, in accord with ancient Greek idiom. Contrary to Moulton, who thought that the historical present did not function in literature as a literary form, it functions in Mark as in earlier Greek literature in highly systematic fashion as a discourse marker to denote semantic shifts to more prominent material. Thus it can no longer be argued convincingly that a Greek writer who uses the historical present frequently is committing a "vulgarism" and attempts to use this as a text-critical criterion should be abandoned. Further, even when a more workable understanding of Mark's use of the historical present is achieved, there exists no compelling reason to follow that style rigorously in making textual judgments, excluding other forms of evidence, in view of the few instances in which Mark does vary his usage.

Pepperdine University
Malibu, CA 90265
U.S.A.

Carroll D. OSBURN

SOMMAIRE

On considère communément le présent historique comme une forme du langage courant, servant à la vivacité de la narration, mais exclue de la littérature narrative proprement dite. Sur cette base, Kilpatrick pose comme critère de critique du texte l'usage de ce présent en Mc. De nombreuses données montrent, toutefois, que, dans la littérature grecque, le présent historique tient lieu d'indice de discours aux niveaux syntaxique et sémantique, et que l'emploi qu'en fait Mc tient de cet usage et non de la langue vulgaire. Il faut donc abandonner la suggestion de Kilpatrick et ne pas reconnaître un critère valable de critique textuelle dans les présents historiques de Mc.

Ps 19 und sein altorientalischer Hintergrund

Prof. Dr. Heinrich Schützinger
zum 11. April 1984 gewidmet

1) Einleitung

Ps 19 ist Gegenstand zahlloser Untersuchungen bis in die jüngste Zeit hinein gewesen⁽¹⁾. Dabei fallen zwei Interessensschwerpunkte bei der Arbeit ins Auge; zum einen die Frage nach der Einheit des Textes, i.e. nach dem Zusammenhang der vv. 2-7 (= 19A)⁽²⁾ und vv. 8-15 (= 19B), zum anderen die Frage nach Herkunft und Bedeutung des ersten Psalmteils.

Seit E. F. C. Rosenmüller⁽³⁾ darauf hingewiesen hat, daß in Ps 19 zwei getrennte selbständige Psalmen vorliegen (*“esse hoc Psalmo duo diversa carmina, aut certe diversorum carminum particulas”*), hat es bis heute keine allgemein anerkannte Sicht bezüglich der Einheitlichkeit oder Uneinheitlichkeit unter den Exegeten mehr gegeben, wenn die Vertreter der Annahme von zwei Psalmen diese opinio communis auch immer wieder postulieren⁽⁴⁾. Hat die unterschiedli-

⁽¹⁾ Vgl. außer den einschlägigen Kommentarwerken die Literaturübersicht bei H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalmen I* (BKAT 15/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) 297; S. G. SAGER, “‘Sun’ and ‘Light’ Imagery in Psalm 19”, *Jewish Civilization* (ed. R. A. Brauner) (Philadelphia 1979) 33-41; O. H. STECK, “Bemerkungen zur thematischen Einheit von Psalm 19,2-7”, *Werden und Wirken des Alten Testaments* (FS. C. Westermann [Hrsg. R. Albertz u.a.]; Göttingen/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1980) 318-324 (= TBü 70 [München 1982] 232-239); C. PETERSEN, *Mythos im Alten Testament* (BZAW 157; Berlin 1982) 85-94; H. GESE, Die Einheit von Psalm 19, *Verifikationen* (FS. G. Ebeling [Hrsg. E. Jüngel u.a.]; Tübingen 1982) 1-10.

⁽²⁾ Zu den nachträglichen Psalmenüberschriften (hier v. 1) vgl. KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 14-29.

⁽³⁾ Vgl. E. F. C. ROSENMÜLLER, *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum*, pars 4, I (Leipzig 1821) 534.

⁽⁴⁾ Vgl. z. B. KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 298 “Schon seit langer Zeit hat man erkannt, daß...”; STECK, *Ps 19*, 318 “Die Psalmenforschung ist sich einig, daß...”; PETERSEN, *Mythos* 85 “Es ist so gut wie unbestritten, daß...”.

che Thematik der beiden Psalmteile A und B die einen zur strikten Trennung beider Teile veranlaßt, so hat sie die anderen besonders durch Vergleich mit altorientalischen Texten nach der inneren Verbundenheit beider Teile suchen lassen⁽⁵⁾. Läßt sich einerseits die unterschiedliche Thematik beider Teile nicht leugnen, so wird andererseits die mögliche Verbindung der Teile auch zugestanden. Es differiert nur die Beurteilung der unterschiedlichen Elemente: Liegt die Zuordnung von A und B auf der Ebene der Redaktion, oder ist B spätere Ergänzung oder Nachinterpretation zu A, oder sind A und B der bewußten Komposition *einer* Verfasserhand zuzuschreiben? Wobei die letztgenannte Möglichkeit noch vor der Frage nach möglichen eingearbeiteten Vorlagen steht.

Den genannten Fragen widmet sich die vorliegende Untersuchung durch eine losgelöste Betrachtung des ersten Psalmteils (A) und seines viel beschworenen altorientalischen Hintergrundes und der darauffolgenden Integration der gewonnenen Ergebnisse in eine Beurteilung des ganzen Psalms.

2) *Sprache und Form*

Insgesamt ist der Text von Ps 19A problemlos. Abgesehen von einigen unbedeutenden Abweichungen einiger Textzeugen⁽⁶⁾ bietet nur das *qawwām* (v. 5a) Schwierigkeiten, da *qaw* im AT nur mit der Bedeutung "Schnur, Meßschnur"⁽⁷⁾ belegt ist. Zahlreiche und recht unterschiedliche Erklärungen und Korrekturen sind für dieses Wort vorgeschlagen worden. So möchte H.-J. Kraus⁽⁸⁾ zwar bei *qaw* bleiben und verweist auf das Schall- und Lallwort in Jes 28,10.13, wogegen H. Donner⁽⁹⁾ mit Recht einwendet, daß es unwahrscheinlich sei, ein solches Schallwort mit einem Suffix zu konstruieren; H. Torczyner (Tur-Sinai)⁽¹⁰⁾ und im Anschluß daran R. J. Tournay⁽¹¹⁾ gehen

⁽⁵⁾ Vgl. im einzelnen die Übersicht bei D. J. A. CLINES, "The Tree of Knowledge and the Law of Yahweh (Psalm XIX)", *VT* 24 (1974) 8-14 und ergänzend dazu GESE, *Einheit*, 1f.

⁽⁶⁾ Vgl. im einzelnen BHK und BHS.

⁽⁷⁾ Vgl. HALAT 830a.

⁽⁸⁾ KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 298.

⁽⁹⁾ H. DONNER, "Ugaritismen in der Psalmenforschung", *ZAW* 79 (1967) 327 Anm. 31.

⁽¹⁰⁾ N. H. TUR-SINAI, "Šiṭṭir šamê, die Himmelschrift" *ArOr* 17 (1949) 419-433.

auch von *qaw* "Schnur etc." aus, denken aber in Parallele zur akkadischen Metapher für Sterne *šitir šamê/šamāmi* "Himmelschrift"⁽¹²⁾ an den Sternenhimmel. Verbindung zu ugaritischen Wörtern nehmen M. Dahood⁽¹³⁾ (*qawwah/qāwāh*) und M. Weippert⁽¹⁴⁾ (*qr*) an, was natürlich einiges an Implikationen bezüglich Alter und Herkunft des Textes beinhaltet. Bei der Grundbedeutung von *qaw* möchte neuerdings wieder H. Gese bleiben, er deutet es so: "daß im Zusammenhang der mit der Meßschnur gemessenen Erde in einem poetischen Text metonymisch das Maß bezeichnet werden kann, ist auch dann nachzuempfinden, wenn durch das 'Wort' die Messung geschieht und das Maß gesetzt wird"⁽¹⁵⁾. Diese Deutung sprengt aber den inhaltlichen Rahmen der Verse und fügt sich schwerlich zum Parallelwort *millêhem* (v. 5aß). Die notwendige Parallelität beider Worte wurde oft schon betont und hat beispielsweise D. Fokos-Fuchs⁽¹⁶⁾ zur Änderung dieses Wortes in *middêhem* unter Beibehaltung des *qawwām* angeregt. Gegenüber all diesen Versuchen scheint aber immer noch die von zahlreichen Exegeten vollzogene Korrektur von *qawwām* in *qôlām* die beste Lösung zu sein, da hierzu die Äquivalente der Übersetzung (LXX: *phthoggos*; Symmachus: *ēchos*; Hieronymus: *sonus*) und der Kontext (vgl. die Stichwortaufnahmen) am besten passen. Gelegentlich vorgenommene Korrekturen von *šām* in *šām* oder von *bāhem* in *bāyyām* (v. 5b) haben keinen Rückhalt im Text⁽¹⁷⁾ und sind unnötig. Die von H.-J. Kraus⁽¹⁸⁾ aufgrund einiger

(¹¹) R. J. TOURNAY, "Notules sur les Psaumes (Pss XIX, 2-5; LXXI, 15-16)", *Alttestamentliche Studien* (FS. F. Nötscher [Hrsg. H. Junker und J. Botterweck]) (BBB 1; Bonn 1950) 271-274.

(¹²) Zur Diskussion vgl. J. VAN DER PLOEG, "Psalm XIX and some of its Problems", *JEOL* 17 (1963) 196; zu den akkadischen Belegstellen *AHw* 1253a.

(¹³) M. J. DAHOOD, "Rez. zu R. Tournay, R. Schwab, *Les Psaumes 1955*", *CBQ* 19 (1957) 148 und DERS., *Psalms I* (AB) (Garden City-New York 1966) 122.

(¹⁴) M. WEIPPERT, "Zum Text von Ps 19,5 und Jes 22,5", *ZAW* 73 (1961) 97-99.

(¹⁵) GESE, *Einheit*, 4 Anm. 13.

(¹⁶) D. FOKOS-FUCHS, "Psalm XIX: 5", *I. Goldziher Memorial II* (1958) 136-146.

(¹⁷) Zur Funktion und Bedeutung des *bāhem* s.u. und zur Parallelkonstruktion in Ps 19,12 vgl. GESE, *Einheit*, 5.

(¹⁸) KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 298.

Textzeugen vorgenommene Änderung von 'al in 'ad (v. 7aß) ist überflüssig, wenn man 'al als Relationsdeterminativum⁽¹⁹⁾ auffaßt, so daß man den vorliegenden Nominalsatz folgendermaßen verstehen kann: Sein (des Sonnenballs) Wendepunkt ist in bezug auf ihre (der Himmel) Enden, i.e. liegt an ihrem Ende.

Der Text bietet eine recht klare Struktur. Die folgende Darstellung bietet Kolometrie und Konsonantenzählung im Anschluß an die Vorschläge von O. Loretz⁽²⁰⁾, sodann Wortzählung (dazu s.u.) und eine Graphik der entscheidenden Suffixbezüge im Text (dazu s.u.).

2 a	השמים מספרים כבוד אל	17	4		↑		↑		↑		↑
b	ומעשה ידיו מגיד הרקיע	18	4								
3 a	יום ליום יביע אמר	14	4								
b	ולילה ללילה יחזה דעת	17	4								
4 a	אין אמר ואין דברים	15	4								
b	בלי נשמע קולם	11	3								
5 a	בכל הארץ יצא קולם	(14)	4								
b	ובקצה תבל מליהם	13	3								
c	לשמש שם אהל בהם	12	4								
6 a	והוא כחתן יצא מחפתו	16	4								
b	ישיש כגבור לרוץ ארח	16	4								
7 a	מקצה השמים מוצאו	14	3								
b	ותקופתו על קצותם	14	3								
c	ואין נסתר מחמתו	13	3								

In seiner Untersuchung zur thematischen Einheit von Ps 19A beschreibt O. H. Steck diesen als Sonnentext, der aus zwei Aussage-reihen bestehe (2-5a + 5b-7), wobei "die zweite (...) die bewußte Fortsetzung der ersten (ist), die die geheimnisvolle Zusammenstellung von Aussagezügen der ersten klärt und begründet"⁽²¹⁾. Ein erster

⁽¹⁹⁾ Vgl. C. DOHMEN, "'al-(ham)mizbeah. Zur Bedeutung und Verwen-dung von hebr. 'al", *Biblische Notizen* 16 (1981) 7-10.

⁽²⁰⁾ Vgl. O. LORETZ, "Die Analyse der ugaritischen und hebräischen Poe-sie mittels Stichometrie und Konsonantenzählung", *UF* 7 (1975) 265-269; ders., *Die Psalmen. Teil II* (AOAT 207/2; Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1979).

⁽²¹⁾ STECK, *Ps 19*, 323.

Blick auf die kolometrische Darstellung des Textes fordert aber zu einer differenzierteren Betrachtung des kurzen Textes heraus. Das erste Bikolon, der chiasmatische Parallelismus in 2, übernimmt deutlich Einleitungs- und zugleich Überschriftfunktion. Die drei folgenden Bikola entfalten den Inhalt des ersten in je eigener Weise. In 3 wird das Kundegeschehen in zeitlicher, in 5a.b in räumlicher Dimension entfaltet, dazwischen liegt 4 (aufgrund der Kolometrie wird deutlich, daß 4a nur *ein* Kolon ist), in dem dieses Geschehen als von besonderer Art (s.u.) charakterisiert wird. Erst in 5c findet sich folglich die eigentliche Fortsetzung des ersten Bikolons, was auch durch das fehlende bzw. nur aus 2a zu ergänzende Subjekt zur finiten Verbform *šām* (Suffixkonjugation!) in 5c angezeigt wird und durch den Bezug zu *šamayim* durch *bāhem*, das hier wohl instrumental, d.h. durch die Himmel ist der Sonne das Zelt errichtet, zu verstehen ist⁽²²⁾. In 5c und 7c stehen zwei Kola, zwischen denen eine Entfaltung von 5a.b steht, die das in 3a-5b Ausgesagte von dem in 5c eingeführten Konkretum (*šemeš*) her entfaltet. Daß 6-7b die Entfaltung von 5a.b ist, machen auch die Wortaufnahmen deutlich; so kommt die Wurzel *yš'* von 5a in 6a und 7a, das *qāṣeh* von 5b wieder in 7a und 7b vor. Aufgrund der durch die Setzung (*šām* Suffixkonjugation) der Sonne in 5c hergestellten Analogie (zum Inhaltlichen s.u. 4) zur abstrakt formulierten Aussage von 3a-5b erweist sich das formal an 4 angelehnte Kolon 7c (s.u.), das auf die Wirkung der Sonne abhebt (vgl. in Parallele die obengenannte Charakterisierung von 4 im Rahmen von 3a-5b), als Fortsetzung von 5c und bildet mit diesem zusammen ein auseinandergezogenes Bikolon, das den dazwischenliegenden Entfaltungsteil (s.o.) rahmt. Somit ergibt sich eine zweigliedrige Struktur des Textes, die zentralen Kola 2a.b und 5c.7c (man kann sie somit Themakola nennen), die die beiden thematischen Entfaltungen rahmen und umklammern. Blickt man nun auf die durch Suffixe hergestellten Bezüge im Text, wie sie die obige Graphik zeigt, dann wird in Zusammenschau mit dem bisher Dargelegten deutlich, daß die von O. H. Steck erkannten zwei Aussagereihen nur eine Ebene der Psalmkomposition erfassen; denn 5c-7c ist nicht nur Entfaltung von 2a-5b, sondern bildet einen kleinen gerahmten Text, der sich an 2a.b anschließt. Besonders das Abschlußkolon 7c

(²²) So auch PETERSEN, *Mythos*, 89ff.

geht in seiner besonderen Bedeutung bei O. H. Steck verloren⁽²³⁾, da er es nur knapp unter inhaltlichem Gesichtspunkt betrachtet. Es muß aber berücksichtigt werden, daß 7c durch die *'ên*-Formulierung und Partizip einen formalen Bezug zu den *'ên*-Sätzen von 4a herstellt und damit eine formale Verknüpfung von erster und zweiter Aussagereihe auf der einen Ebene und von Themakola (2a.b und 5c.7c) und Entfaltungsteil auf der anderen Ebene bildet. Der sich als komplexes Kompositionsganzes darstellende Text enthält ein weiteres formales Strukturprinzip, die von vielen Exegeten bereits betonte Stichwortaufnahme, wie sie für die Entfaltung von 6a-7b aus 5a.b bereits oben beschrieben wurde. Interessanter noch sind diese Aufnahmen im ersten Teil gestaltet, da die Differenzierungen die inhaltlichen Präzisierungen quasi spielerisch vornehmen. So wird in 3a das Geschehen aus 2a.b als *'omer* charakterisiert, der zweite Teil des Bikolons präzisiert es als *dā'at*. 4a kehrt nun zu dem *'omer* zurück und grenzt durch die *'ên*-Formulierung jetzt quasi negativ ab, indem *'omer* mit *d'barīm* parallelisiert und im zweiten Teil des Bikolons von 4 dann sogar in *belī nišmā'* gesteigert und präzisiert wird.

Das Kundegeschehen von 2 meint also Rede-Wissen, nicht aber Rede-Wörter, d.h. eine Kunde, die zwar vorhanden ist, nicht aber durch Wörter und hörbare Stimme vernommen werden kann, folglich dem Menschen nicht unmittelbar zugänglich ist. Das *qōl* wird im folgenden Bikolon, das die räumliche Dimension des Kundegeschehens (s.o.) beschreibt, aufgenommen⁽²⁴⁾ und in 5b durch *millā* präzisiert. Durch 'Stimme' und 'Gesprochenes'⁽²⁵⁾ wird in 5a.b wieder — wie in 3 — das positive Vorhandensein der Kunde hervorgehoben, beide Worte in 5 knüpfen an 4 an, um das Vorhandensein der Kunde auf dem Hintergrund der besonderen Aussagen von 4 nicht untergehen zu lassen.

Dieses Prinzip der Gestaltung des Textes durch Anknüpfung und Variation bedingt ein weiteres Problem des Psalms. Oft schon wurde auf die Aramaismen in Ps 19A aufmerksam gemacht, und besonders all den Exegeten, die den Text für besonders alt hielten⁽²⁶⁾, mußten

(23) Seine Bemerkung: "V. 7b schließlich hebt in einem letzten Aspekt die umfassende Reichweite der Sonne in ihrer unwiderstehlichen Glut (...) hervor", Ps 19, 321 läßt jeglichen formalen Aspekt außer Betracht.

(24) Zur Textänderung von *qawwām* in *qōlām* s.o.

(25) *millā* von *mll* 'sprechen' hebt diesen Aspekt hervor.

(26) KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 299, beispielsweise sagt, daß "Ps 19A alle Kennzei-

diese Worte ein Dorn im Auge sein. J. Morgenstern⁽²⁷⁾ hat u.a. diese Beobachtung sogar dazu veranlaßt, die vv. 3-5a als Interpolation zu erklären.

Die Aramaismen betreffen jedoch alle das Kundegeschehen⁽²⁸⁾ (*nb'* 3a⁽²⁹⁾, *ḥwh* 3b⁽³⁰⁾; *mlh* 5b⁽³¹⁾), so daß sich diese Aramaismen von hierher erklären lassen, und nicht als sekundäre Zusätze o.ä., da die poetische Sprache bei ihrer Suche nach Synonymen — besonders durch die Verwendung von Parallelismen — auch auf Lehnworte zurückgreift⁽³²⁾. Auf diesem Hintergrund wird eine weitere Assoziation deutlich, da das *nb'* "hervorsprudeln" in 3a an das *ngd* von 2b anknüpft und dieses im Aramäischen auch "strömen, fließen" heißt⁽³³⁾. O. H. Steck hat bereits darauf hingewiesen, daß diese das Kundegeschehen betreffenden Ausdrücke sämtlich im "Vokabular weisheitlicher Lehrterminologie"⁽³⁴⁾ koinzidieren, und H. Gese⁽³⁵⁾ hat diesen weisheitlichen Ort des ganzen Psalms besonders betont. Auf diesem Hintergrund gilt es auch einzelne Worte und Wendungen, wie das entscheidende Objekt im ersten Kolon (2a) *kēbôd-'ēl* und seine Parallele in 2b *ma'asēh jādāw* neu zu untersuchen. Vor allem die Wendung *kēbôd-'ēl* hat wohl zur These von der kanaänä-

chen eines hohen Alters trägt", ohne jedoch diese Kennzeichen auch nur zu benennen.

(²⁷) J. MORGENSTERN, "Psalms 8 and 19A", *HUCA* 19 (1945/46) 491-523; hier bes. 509ff.

(²⁸) Hinzu kommt vielleicht noch mit M. WAGNER, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch* (BZAW 96; Berlin 1966) Nr. 103, das *ḥammātō* aus 7c, wobei er mit H. Gressmann in einen Infinitiv von *ḥmh* (so auch *HALAT*³ 313a) konjiziert; vgl. aber auch K.-M. BEYSE, "*ḥmm*", *TWAT* II, 1048.

(²⁹) Vgl. *DISO* 173; *KAI* 223B8 geht wohl zurück auf akkadisch *nabā'u(m)* "etwa 'aufsteigen, aufsprudeln'?" *AHW* 697.

(³⁰) Vgl. WAGNER, *Aramaismen* Nr. 91, vgl. auch akkadisch *ḥaw/mū* "summen" *AHW* 338b, wo W. von Soden diese Verbindung zu aramäisch *ḥawwī* schon andeutete; vgl. auch J. A. SOGGIN, *Old Testament and Oriental Studies* (BibOr 29; Rom 1975) 203-209.

(³¹) Vgl. WAGNER, *Aramaismen*, Nr. 171.

(³²) Vgl. WAGNER, *Aramaismen*, 158 § 9.

(³³) Vgl. im AT z. B. Dan 7,10; *HALAT* 1098; L. LEVY, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim* III (Darmstadt 1963=1924) 332b; WAGNER, *Aramaismen*, Nr. 92, weist auf *ngd hi.* als Äquivalent zu *ḥwh* hin.

(³⁴) STECK, *Ps 19*, 324.

(³⁵) GESE, *Einheit*, passim.

ischen Herkunft und dem hohen Alter des Textes beigetragen⁽³⁶⁾. Es will jedoch beachtet sein, daß die Verbindung *kēbôd-’ēl* innerhalb des AT kein zweites Mal begegnet⁽³⁷⁾ und daß die Verwendung der Gottesbezeichnung *’ēl* keinesfalls auf sehr alte Texte beschränkt ist, sondern gerade in sehr jungen Texten des AT wieder auftritt⁽³⁸⁾. Die Schwierigkeit der Deutung des *kēbôd-’ēl* wird besonders deutlich, wenn man den Parallelismus ernst nimmt und beachtet, daß das Parallelwort *ma’āsēh jādāw* im Sinne von “Schöpfungswerk Gottes” an der vorliegenden Stelle Schwierigkeiten bietet in bezug auf die Subjekte von 2a.b *šamayim* und *rāqīa’*. Die fehlende semantische Kohärenz zwischen Prädikaten, Subjekten und Objekten (visuell-auditiv) ist hier besonders deutlich, aber als inhaltlich vorausgesetzte Spannung für den Text (s.u.) bedeutsam. Daraus folgt, daß auch eine Aufteilung auf zwei Bereiche, den himmlischen und den geschöpflichen⁽³⁹⁾, dem Bikolon nicht gerecht wird. Im Rahmen des bereits mehrmals angesprochenen weisheitlichen Hintergrundes des Textes ist die Verwendung der Wortverbindung *ma’āsēh jādāw* zu sehen; in diesen Texten bezeichnet nämlich der Ausdruck nicht nur das “Schöpfungswerk”, sondern das “Walten” oder den “Plan Gottes in der Welt”, bzw. die Ordnung in der Schöpfung als eine von Gott gesetzte⁽⁴⁰⁾. Mit diesem Verständnis des Ausdrucks *ma’āsēh jādāw* als Schöpfungsordnung wird dann auch die parallele Wendung *kēbôd-’ēl* verständlich; die durch die Schöpfung sichtbar werdende, sie durchwaltende Ordnung. Somit rückt *kēbôd-’ēl* hier in die Nähe der

⁽³⁶⁾ Vgl. z. B. W. SCHMIDT, “Jerusalemmer El-Tradition bei Jesaja”, *ZRGG* 16 (1964) 308f.; T. N. D. METTINGER, *Dethronement of Sabaoth* (Lund 1982) 107; H. D. PREUSS, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im Alten Testament* (BWANT 92; Stuttgart 1971) 106f. mit folgenschweren Hypothesen aufgrund dieser Einordnung: “... enthält der Anfang von Ps 19A jetzt zugleich einen Spott über ägyptische und mesopotamische Glaubensvorstellungen”.

⁽³⁷⁾ Die häufig hinzugesetzte Parallele (vgl. z. B. W. SCHMIDT, *ibid.*; H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja* [BKAT 10/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1980] 250) aus Ps 29 *’ēl hakkābôd* ist nicht nur von der Formulierung her, sondern auch von der Einbettung in den Kontext her anders geartet.

⁽³⁸⁾ Vgl. F. M. CROSS, “*’ēl*”, *TWAT* I, 277; W. H. SCHMIDT, “*’ēl*, Gott”, *THAT* I, 148f.

⁽³⁹⁾ Vgl. R. RENDTORFF, “Die Offenbarungsvorstellungen im Alten Israel”, *KuD Beiheft* 1 (Göttingen 1965) 28.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Vgl. P. ACKROYD, “*jād*”, *TWAT* III, 455; J. VOLLMER, “*’šh*, machen, tun”, *THAT* II, 365.369; allgemein: WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 188f.

Beschreibungen der Repräsentationsweisen Gottes und steht damit der häufig im AT zu findenden, in formaler Hinsicht parallelen Formulierung *kəbôd-JHWH* nahe⁽⁴¹⁾. Diese Verbindung betonte G. v. Rad auch schon für Jes 6,3, wenn er formuliert: "Aber der Satz, daß 'die Herrlichkeit Jahwes' die ganze Erde 'ausfülle', spricht doch auch wieder von einer schöpfungsimmanenten Qualität"⁽⁴²⁾. Das gegenseitige Explizieren der Begriffe im Parallelismus führt zu einem Verständnis der Objektaussage des ersten Bikolons, das die Begriffe inhaltlich in die Reihe der Weisheitstermini stellt, wobei die beiden Aspekte dieser Weisheit — sie ist Gottes Herrlichkeit und sie ist sein Werk — betont sind⁽⁴³⁾. Somit geht es hier nicht um "*Kabod*-Akklationen"⁽⁴⁴⁾ und auch ist der Gottes-*Kabod* nicht die Schöpferherrlichkeit⁽⁴⁵⁾, sondern die vom Schöpfer in die Schöpfung gelegte Ordnung, die von ihm ein erhabenes Zeugnis gibt⁽⁴⁶⁾, wird in 2a.b plastisch im Bild vom Himmel in den Blick genommen.

Aufgrund der bisherigen Darlegung tritt eine kleine stilistische Beobachtung hervor; wurde im Anschluß an F. Crüsemann für Ps 19A festgehalten, daß dieser "ganz außerhalb der sonstigen Formsprache des Hymnus"⁽⁴⁷⁾ stehe und "völlig singuläre Formen"⁽⁴⁸⁾ aufweise, so muß aber zumindest auf die Partizipialkonstruktionen in 2a.b hingewiesen werden⁽⁴⁹⁾, denn gerade auf die Beziehung von Hymnus und Weisheit hat F. Crüsemann bei der Behandlung der

⁽⁴¹⁾ Vgl. W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (BKAT 13/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1979) 57f.; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 249f.; M. WEINFELD, "*kābôd*", *TWAT* IV, 34ff.; C. WESTERMANN, "*kbd*, schwer sein", *THAT* I, 806ff.

⁽⁴²⁾ G. VON RAD, *Weisheit in Israel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1970) 203.

⁽⁴³⁾ Vgl. H. H. SCHMID, *Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit* (BZAW 101; Berlin 1966) 152f.; vgl. auch VON RADS, *Weisheit*, 204, Formulierung für das "weltimmanente Etwas, das die Texte 'Weisheit' nennen": "Die zurückreflektierende 'Herrlichkeit' der Welt".

⁽⁴⁴⁾ So STECK, *Ps 19*, 324, wogegen auch schon O. LORETZ, *UF* 12 (1980) 463, in seiner Rezension votierte.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ So GESE, *Einheit*, 3.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Zu Gemeinsamkeit und Differenz von Schöpfungsordnung und Weisheit in Ägypten und im AT vgl. SCHMID, *Wesen*, bes. 152f.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ F. CRÜSEMANN, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel* (WMANT 32; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969) 306 Anm. 1.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 299.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Sie finden ihre Entsprechungen in der Reihe von Partizipien in 19B s.u. 4).

hymnischen Partizipien hingewiesen⁽⁵⁰⁾. Die singuläre Form von 2a.b mag vielleicht auf das Zusammentreffen der beiden Elemente im vorliegenden Kontext zurückgehen⁽⁵¹⁾.

Auf das Metrum des Psalms einzugehen ist von vorneherein mit großen Schwierigkeiten belastet, da ein Konsens bezüglich rhythmischer Gesetzmäßigkeiten der hebräischen Poesie bis heute nicht gefunden ist⁽⁵²⁾, so daß folglich auch für den vorliegenden Text die Untersuchung des Metrums beispielsweise bei H. Gese und H.-J. Kraus voneinander abweicht, womit die Notwendigkeit einer theoretischen Klärung im Vorfeld evident ist. Innerhalb der Arbeiten, die sich mit diesem Problem beschäftigt haben⁽⁵³⁾, sind die von S. Segert besonders hervorzuheben⁽⁵⁴⁾, da dieser erstmalig versucht, den historischen Gegebenheiten der Textgenese im AT durch Anwendung unterschiedlicher metrischer Theorien gerecht zu werden. Er unterscheidet 1. eine reine Wortmetrik für die älteste Zeit; 2. ein akzentuierendes System für die Königszeit; 3. ein alternierendes System für die Spätzeit. Auf Einzelheiten kann im Rahmen dieser Arbeit nicht eingegangen werden, eine interessante Beobachtung ist jedoch erwähnenswert. Der gesamte (!) Ps 19 stellt sich als sinnvolles Gebilde im Sinne reiner Wortmetrik dar⁽⁵⁵⁾. Eine zeitliche Einordnung gemäß der Vorgabe S. Segerts aufgrund dieser Beobachtung steht aber allen bisherigen Ergebnissen der Untersuchung entgegen, so daß nur zu fragen bleibt, ob nicht vielleicht auch bei der Verwendung metrischer Systeme ein Aufgreifen alter Elemente in der jüngeren

⁽⁵⁰⁾ CRÜSEMANN, *Studien*, 120f.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Vgl. auch die von CRÜSEMANN, *Studien*, 120, beschriebenen inhaltlichen Beziehungen, wie sie auch in Ps 19A teils anklingen.

⁽⁵²⁾ Zu den wichtigsten Problemen und bisherigen Lösungsvorschlägen vgl. K. KOCH, *Was ist Formgeschichte?* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1981) § 8; sowie KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 29-36.

⁽⁵³⁾ Vgl. im einzelnen die Literaturangaben bei KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 29-36.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ S. SEGERT, "Vorarbeiten zur hebräischen Metrik I-II" *ArOr* 21 (1953) 481-542; DERS., "Die Methoden der althebräischen Metrik", *Communio viatorum* 1 (1958) 233-241; DERS., "Problems of Hebrew Prosody", *VT* 7 (1960) 283-291; DERS., "Versbau und Sprachbau in der althebräischen Poesie", *MIO* 15 (1969) 312-321.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Für Ps 19A vgl. die oben neben dem Text angegebene 2. Spalte mit der Wortzählung; Ps 19B stellt sich wie folgt dar:
3-2/3-2/3-2/3-2/3-2/3-2/2-2/2-2/4-3/3-2/4-3/3-2/4-3-3/.

Zeit alttestamentlicher Literaturgeschichte zu finden ist, wie es auf der Wortebene bereits beobachtet wurde⁽⁵⁶⁾.

3) *Das Motiv und seine Bedeutung*

Die erkannte strukturelle Mehrschichtigkeit des Textes findet ihre Entsprechung in den verschiedenen inhaltlichen Aspekten, die in ihrer inneren Verwobenheit das Gesamt der Aussage des Psalms ausmachen. Die für das Denken des Alten Orients typische Zusammenstellung der Aspekte bedingt gerade bei einem poetischen Text die Notwendigkeit, die Eigenbedeutung der einzelnen Aspekte losgelöst genau zu erfassen, um ihre Aussagekraft für das Ganze frei zu setzen. Eine derartige "Detailkenntnis" fordert aber ein Wissen, das über den Einzeltext hinausgeht, bzw. ihm voraus- und zugrundeliegt. Es ist das Verdienst O. Keels, das Gemeinsame der Vorstellungswelt in Wort und Bild für alttestamentliche Exegese eröffnet und dargelegt zu haben⁽⁵⁷⁾. Sein Hinweis: "Diese 'multiplicity of approaches', die einem bei der ao (altorientalischen) Ikonographie in die Augen springt, finden wir in den Pss ganz ähnlich"⁽⁵⁸⁾, weist darauf hin, daß die altorientalische Ikonographie einen Zugang zu den sich im Text sprachlich artikulierenden Vorstellungen geben kann. Für den vorliegenden Text hat die formale Analyse die Themakola 2a.b.5c.7c als Zentrum des Psalms aufgewiesen. Versucht man nun, das darin ausgedrückte Bild nachzuzeichnen, dann kommt man zum Bild von Himmel und Sonne, das in der altorientalischen Ikonographie in Form der sogenannten "geflügelten Sonnenscheibe" weit verbreitet ist. Das Motiv der Flügelsonne hat seinen Ursprung in Ägypten und verbreitete sich von dort aus über den ganzen Orient⁽⁵⁹⁾. In den verschiedenen Kulturkreisen hat die Bedeutung des Motivs teils eigene Entwicklung durchlaufen⁽⁶⁰⁾. Die Flügelsonne dürfte "in Syrien/Palä-

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Vgl. z. B. die Verwendung von 'ēl, dazu Anm. 38.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Vgl. für die Psalmen besonders O. KEEL, *Die Welt der altorientalischen Bildsymbolik und das Alte Testament* (Zürich u.a. 1977).

⁽⁵⁸⁾ KEEL, *Bildsymbolik*, 9.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Vgl. O. EISSFELDT, "Die Flügelsonne als künstlerisches Motiv und als religiöses Symbol", *FF* 19 (1942) 145-147 (= *KISchr.* 2; [Tübingen 1963] 416-419).

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Vgl. z. B. D. WILDUNG, "Flügelsonne", *LexAg* II, 277-279; B. PERING, "Die geflügelte Scheibe in Assyrien", *AfO* 8 (1933) 281-296; E. DOUGLAS VAN BUREN, *Symbols of the Gods in Mesopotamian Art* (AnOr 23; Rom

stina wie in ihrem Heimatland Ägypten als Sonnensymbol an sich aufgefaßt worden sein”⁽⁶¹⁾. Es zeigt sich eine Zweifelhait in der Bedeutung des Motivs, zum einen das Schützen, was durch die Flügel ausgedrückt wird⁽⁶²⁾, zum anderen die lebensspendende Wirkung der Sonne⁽⁶³⁾: Der Inhalt des Textes vom Ps 19A lebt geradezu von dieser positiven Wirkung, die das Symbol ausdrückt⁽⁶⁴⁾. Somit liegt im vorliegenden Psalm ein schönes Beispiel für die poetische Realisation eines altorientalischen Motivs, dessen ikonographische Realisation bereits weithin bekannt ist, vor. Die wechselseitige Betrachtung von Poesie und Ikonographie hilft in hohem Maße, die dem Motiv innewohnende Bedeutung zu fassen und für die Auslegung fruchtbar zu machen. Die textliche Erwähnung dieses Motivs beschränkt sich im AT⁽⁶⁵⁾ nicht auf Ps 19A; denn hinter der Formulierung *šemeš š’dāqā ūmarpē’ bikēnāpēhā* (Mal 3,20) steht wohl auch dieses Motiv der Flügelsonne, worauf des öfteren bereits hingewiesen wurde⁽⁶⁶⁾, und die explizite Nennung der Bedeutung/Wirkung weist in die gleiche Richtung wie sie oben für Ps 19A vorgetragen wurde.

4) Ps 19 – eine Einheit?

Zahlreiche Elemente der Deutung von Ps 19A kamen bisher schon zur Sprache. Zusammenfassend gilt es nun, vornehmlich auf die beiden erkannten Ebenen des Textes und ihre gegenseitige Bezo-

1945) 94-104; W. FAUTH, “Sonnengottheit (^dUTU) und ‘Königliche Sonne’ (^dUTU^g) bei den Hethitern”, *UF* 11 (1979) 227-263.

⁽⁶¹⁾ B. HROUDA, “Göttersymbole und -attribute”, *RLA* III, 491.

⁽⁶²⁾ Vgl. W. DOMMERSHAUSEN, “*kānāp*”, *TWAT* IV, 243-246; KEEL, *Bildsymbolik*, 170ff.

⁽⁶³⁾ Vgl. KEEL, *Bildsymbolik*, 22f., 189-197.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Vgl. dazu unter 4); für die in Anm. 28 genannte Konjektur bei *mēḥammātō* in 7c spricht vielleicht, daß durch sie die positive Seite eher hervortritt.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch ist eine direkte Bezeichnung für die Flügelsonne nicht belegt, vgl. T. HARTMANN, “*šemeš*, Sonne”, *THAT* II, 987-999; genannt findet sie sich aber vielleicht in dem phön. ‘*pt* der Inschrift des Jehaumilik (*KAI* 10,5), bzw. im heth. ^dUTU^g (W. FAUTH, *UF* 11, 236) und sie ist vielleicht auch bei einigen Belegen des akkad. *šamšatu* (*AHW* 1158b) gemeint.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Vgl. K. ELLIGER, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* II (ATD 25; Göttingen 1975) 215; G. J. BOTTERWECK, “Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit am Tage Jahwes”, *BiLe* 1 (1960) 259; KEEL, *Bildsymbolik*, 22.

genheit bei der Auslegung des Stückes zu achten. Das Zentrum des Psalms (2a.b.5c.7c.) erfaßt im Bild von Himmel und Sonne die schützende und lebensspendende Wirkung der der Schöpfung von ihrem Schöpfer eingegebenen Urordnung, von der die Schöpfung als solche Zeugnis gibt. Auf die weisheitliche Herkunft des Textes wurde auch schon mehrfach hingewiesen, und G. v. Rad benennt das gerade beschriebene Thema als dem Kontext weisheitlicher Lehre zugehörig: "Nach der Meinung der Lehrer konnte sich Jahwe neben Priestern und Propheten auch eines ganz anderen Mediums bedienen, um die Menschen zu erreichen, nämlich der aus der Schöpfung ergehenden Stimme der Urordnung, und diesem Offenbarungsmittler galt das besondere Interesse der Weisen"⁽⁶⁷⁾. Das Bild von der Sonne vermag eine für die Weisheit typische Analogie herzustellen, um den Charakter dieser alles erfüllenden Schöpfungsordnung zu beschreiben⁽⁶⁸⁾. Das das Kundegeschehen nun entfaltende Stück (3–5b + 6–7b) stellt der zeitlichen und räumlichen Allgegenwart dieser Kunde ihre Unerkennbarkeit für den Menschen gegenüber und deutet sie damit als Schöpfungsgeheimnis. Die Nähe zu Ijob 28, wo diese vorhandene aber unfaßbare Urordnung als 'Weisheit' und 'Vernunft' (vv. 12.20) bezeichnet wird, ist nicht zu übersehen⁽⁶⁹⁾. Dieses Nebeneinander von Vorhandensein und Unerkennbarkeit erhält im Text eine besonders markante Gestaltung, da die positive Wirkung der vorhandenen Kunde in den Themakola (2a.b.5c.7c) im Bild (Flügelsonne) und damit quasi verborgen artikuliert und mit der poetisch verdichteten Entfaltung und inhaltlichen Kontrastierung des Geschehens verwoben wird. Es ist diese innere Spannung, die den kurzen Text zusammenhält, und die Frage, die in ihm liegt, ist nicht als *Rätsel* über Himmel und Sonne formuliert, wie es H. Torczyner⁽⁷⁰⁾ annahm, sondern sie bleibt angesichts der Erkenntnis von der Unerkennbarkeit der die Schöpfung durchwaltenden Ordnung bestehen. Gehört der vorliegen-

⁽⁶⁷⁾ VON RAD, *Weisheit*, 213.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Vgl. auch das in der ägyptischen Ikonographie begegnende Thema der den Raum zwischen Himmel und Erde erfüllenden göttlichen Ordnung, vgl. KEEL, *Bildsymbolik*, 21f.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Vgl. G. FOHRER, *Hiob* (KAT 16; Gütersloh 1963) 389-399; A. DE WILDE, *Das Buch Hiob* (OTS 22; Leiden 1981) 267-279; und zum Ganzen VON RAD, *Weisheit*, bes. 189-194.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ H. TORCZYNER, "The Riddle in the Bible", *HUCA* 1 (1924) 141-149.

de Text auch in die Reihe der großen Lehrgedichte (Ijob 28; Spr 8; Sir 24)⁽⁷¹⁾, so ist doch die absolute Skepsis, die er der Vernehmbarkeit und Erkennbarkeit der vorhandenen "Selbstoffenbarung der Schöpfung"⁽⁷²⁾ entgegenbringt, was gerade die im Kontext inhaltlich fast konträr laufenden 'én-Formulierungen (4+7c) betonen, nicht zu übersehen. Es muß gefragt werden, ob Ps 19A damit nicht schon in eine skeptische und kritische Position zur Weisheit gelangt, wie sie z. B. Kohelet repräsentiert:

Als ich meinen Sinn darauf richtete,
Weisheit zu lernen
und die Dinge zu beobachten,
die auf Erden geschehen
(ob auch bei Tag und Nacht
in seine Augen kein Schlaf kommt),
da erkannte ich, daß es
dem Menschen unmöglich ist,
das ganze Werk Gottes zu ergründen,
alles, was unter der Sonne geschieht.
Denn wie immer der Mensch
sich abmüht, zu suchen,
er ergründet es nicht;
und selbst wenn der Weise
es zu verstehen meint,
er kann es doch nicht ergründen. (Koh 8,16-17)

Man müßte wohl Ps 19A neben diesen Text stellen und die resignierte und unausweichliche Feststellung als Aussage des Textes festhalten, wenn nicht der Text in 19B weitergehen würde⁽⁷³⁾ und die der Beschreibung der Ordnung des Kosmos in Koh 1,4-11⁽⁷⁴⁾ vergleichbare positive Grundhaltung nicht durchscheinen würde und somit die Frage nach der Beziehung von A und B aufgrund der gewonnenen Einsichten nicht auch neu zu stellen wäre.

Aufgrund altorientalischer Parallelen haben Verfechter der Einheit von Ps 19 immer wieder den thematischen Zusammenhang von

⁽⁷¹⁾ Vgl. auch die Hinweise, die GESE, *Einheit*, passim, zur Verbindung dieser Texte mit Ps 19 angibt.

⁽⁷²⁾ Unter diesem eigentlich etwas zu einseitig formulierten Thema behandelt VON RAD, *Weisheit*, 189-228, alle diese Texte.

⁽⁷³⁾ VAN DER PLOEG, *JEOL* 17, 198, Votum: "In any case, the psalm came to us as a unity and has to be explained as such" will weiter beachtet werden.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Vgl. dazu jetzt N. LOHFINK, *Kohelet* (Neue Echter Bibel; Würzburg 1980) 21f. und Einleitung 5-17.

19A+B zu erhellen gesucht. L. Dürr⁽⁷⁵⁾ hat wohl als erster ausführlich mesopotamische Texte auf den Sonnengott *Šamaš*, in denen dieser mit Recht und Gerechtigkeit in Verbindung gebracht wird, als Beleg für die thematische Einheit von 19A+B angeführt. Jüngst schlug nun S. G. Sager — anscheinend ohne Kenntnis der Arbeit L. Dürres — den gleichen Weg nochmals ein, wenn auch mit weit vermehrter Anzahl derartiger Texte aus dem alten Zweistromland und mit der Absicht “to show that the sun imagery of the entire poem is multipurposed, describing not only the sun, but its Creator, and the law as well”⁽⁷⁶⁾. Ob dieser Weg jedoch geeignet ist, die Einheit des Textes zu beweisen, ist fraglich, da auf ihm erstmal nur auf eine weit verbreitete Lichtsymbolik⁽⁷⁷⁾ (Licht \triangleq Positivem — Finsternis \triangleq Negativem) abgehoben wird, welche auch im Alten Orient in der Verbindung von Werten wie Recht und Gerechtigkeit mit dem Sonnengott begegnet⁽⁷⁸⁾. Geht man aber auf diesem Weg über diese allgemeine Feststellung hinaus, dann tauchen zwei Schwierigkeiten auf: Einerseits wird vorausgesetzt, daß 19A ein Sonnentext sei⁽⁷⁹⁾, andererseits wird für 19B ein recht problematisches Tora-Verständnis vorausgesetzt. Die in den zitierten akkadischen Texten am häufigsten vorkommenden Begriffe *kittu u mišaru* ‘Recht und Gerechtigkeit’ lassen sich schwerlich in Einklang bringen mit dem Verständnis von Tora und den in Ps 19 verwendeten wechselnden Begriffen⁽⁸⁰⁾. Es gibt zwar Verbindungen zwischen der genannten akkadischen Terminologie⁽⁸¹⁾ und alttestamentlichen Formulierungen, wie

⁽⁷⁵⁾ L. DÜRR, “Zur Frage nach der Einheit von Ps 19”, *Sellin-Festschrift. Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte und Archäologie Palästinas* (FS. E. Sellin [Hrsg. A. Jirku]; Leipzig 1927) 37-48.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ S. G. SAGER, ‘Sun’, 34.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ Vgl. S. AALÉN, “Licht und Finsternis”, *RGG*³ IV, 357-359.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Vgl. D. O. EDZARD, “Sonnengott”, *Götter und Mythen im Vorderen Orient*; WdM I (Stuttgart 1965) 126f.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Vgl. zu den altorientalischen Sonnentexten N. SARNA, “Ps XIX and the Near Eastern Sun-God Literature”, *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies I* (Jerusalem 1967) 171-175.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ Gegen eine systematische Abgrenzung der Begriffe in diesem Kontext wendet sich auch KRAUS, *Psalmen* (BKAT 15/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) 996, der im Rahmen von Ps 119 von “Wechselworten für ‘Gesetz’ bzw. ‘Wort Gottes’” spricht.

⁽⁸¹⁾ Vgl. auch W. MAYER, “*jāšar*”, *TWAT* III, 1060f.

sie M. Weinfeld⁽⁸²⁾ untersucht hat, diese haben aber keinen direkten Bezug zur Tora-Terminologie des AT⁽⁸³⁾ und ihrer Bedeutung. Selbst noch im Vergleich der sogenannten Tora-Psalmen (Ps 1; 19B; 119) zeigt Ps 19 seine Eigenheit. Beschreiben Ps 119 und Ps 1 das Verhältnis eines einzelnen zur Tora, so finden sich demgegenüber in Ps 19,8-10 Aussagen über die Tora und partizipial (!) jeweils folgend eine Aussage über ihre Wirkung, so daß Ps 19B in seinem ersten Teil einen hymnusartigen Preis auf die Tora der individuellen Gebetsbitte, die sich in v. 12 durch *bāhem*⁽⁸⁴⁾ anschließt, voranstellt. Diese "Wirkungsaussagen" [s.o. 2) zu 7c] sind es, die über die zahlreichen formalen Entsprechungen⁽⁸⁵⁾ hinaus deutlich machen, daß 19A+B zusammen gehören; denn war in 19A die Rede von der positiven Wirkung der Schöpfungsordnung, deren Unerfaßbarkeit aber in 19A letztlich zur unausweichlichen Frage wurde, so bringt 19B durch diese darüber weit hinausgehenden Wirkungen der Tora die notwendige Antwort und steigert sie gar noch im letzten Teil in die individuelle, direkte Beziehung von Gott und Mensch.

Wenn H. H. Schmid auf die Annäherung und schließliche Identifikation von Weisheit und Gesetz hinweist⁽⁸⁶⁾, dann wird dieser Prozeß bei dem vorgetragenen Verständnis von Ps 19 noch deutlicher. Somit zeigt sich, daß Ps 19A kein Sonnen- oder Schöpfungstext ist⁽⁸⁷⁾, sondern zusammen mit 19B ein kunstvoll komponiertes weisheitliches Lehrgedicht, das stufenartig das Beziehungs- und Kommunikationsverhältnis von Gott und Mensch entfaltet, dabei aus einer Fülle von Wissen schöpft und sich einer Fülle von Formen bedient, um daraus in poetischer Konzentration eine umfassende Lehre zu entwickeln, die in ihrer Vielschichtigkeit Geschlossenheit nach Innen

⁽⁸²⁾ M. WEINFELD, "'Justice and Righteousness' in Ancient Israel against the background of 'Social Reforms' in the Ancient Near East", *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn* (Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 1/2 [Hrsg. H.-J. Nissen/J. Renger]) (CRRA 25; Berlin 1982) 491-519.

⁽⁸³⁾ Vgl. G. LIEDKE/C. PETERSEN, "*tôrā*, Weisung", *THAT II*, 1032-1043; KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 304f.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Zur Parallele in 19,5 vgl. GESE, *Einheit*, 5.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ Auf einige hat GESE, *Einheit*, passim bereits hingewiesen.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ Vgl. SCHMID, *Wesen*, 151.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ Somit ergeben sich auch die Überlegungen zur Frühdatierung bzw. zur Bestimmung ältester Elemente im Text, vgl. z. B. T. HARTMANN, *THAT II*, 998, der von einem entmythologisierten Text spricht.

und Offenheit nach Außen miteinander in Einklang zu bringen vermag. Was G. v. Rad in bezug auf Sir 24 sagt, das gilt ebenso für Ps 19: "Die Weisheit hat versucht, sich das Phänomen der Tora von ihren Voraussetzungen aus — und zwar untraditionell! — zu erklären"⁽⁸⁸⁾.

Alttestamentliches Seminar
Kath.-Theol. Fakultät
Universität Bonn
Regina-Pacis-Weg 1A
D-5300 Bonn 1

Christoph DOHMEN

SOMMAIRE

Le Ps 19A est un texte complexe. Des observations philologiques et structurales montrent que son centre est constitué par les v.2.5b et 7b. Le psaume n'est pas ancien et n'a pas pour arrière-fond un ancien texte oriental sur le soleil, mais il décrit l'ordre de l'univers en utilisant l'image du ciel et du soleil (= disque ailé). L'ensemble du Ps 19 (A+B) forme un poème didactique de composition homogène.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ VON RAD, *Weisheit*, 216.

attività (descritta) dei nemici contro Dio (vv. 3-9)

vv. 10-19: *attività (richiesta) di Dio contro i nemici (vv. 10-17a)*

risultato dell'intervento di Dio (vv. 17b-19).

Vediamo ora più da vicino i diversi collegamenti interni del Salmo.

La richiesta di intervento rivolta a Dio nel v. 2 si articola secondo una triplice domanda contrassegnata da tre *אֵל* posti tra i due vocativi *אֱלֹהִים* e *אֵל*. La negazione *אֵל* fa riferimento a degli atteggiamenti di passività, cui si chiede a Dio di sottrarsi, che pongono contrasto con la descrizione di massima attività dei nemici così come viene descritta nei vv. 3-6. Tale attività si esplica insieme contro Dio e contro Israele, presentata in sequenza chiastica con inizio e fine contrassegnati da *כִּי*:

v. 3: contro Dio (*כִּי אֹיְבֵיךָ מִשְׁנֵאִיד*.....)

v. 4: contro Israele (*עַל עַמְּךָ עֲצֹנִיד*.....)

v. 5: contro Israele (*נִבְחָדִים מִגֹּי לֹא יִזְכֵּר שֵׁם*.....)

v. 6: contro Dio (*כִּי עֲלִיד*.....).

D'altronde, la connotazione di Israele come *עַמְּךָ* e *עֲצֹנִיד*, con il suffisso di 2ª persona riferito a Dio, pone quest'ultimo come il vero destinatario dell'attività aggressiva dei nemici ostili ad Israele: voler cancellare il nome d'Israele (v. 5) significa essere nemici di Dio (v. 3); combattere contro il suo popolo (*עַל עַמְּךָ*, v. 4) si risolve in un combattere contro di Lui (*עֲלִיד*, v. 6)⁽¹⁾.

Segue, ai vv. 7-9, l'elenco di questi nemici; il modo dell'elencazione assume dapprima un ritmo sonoro incalzante, abbreviato, per poi dilatarsi e rallentare dando impressione di solennità man mano che si giunge alle più grandi potenze. Si comincia infatti, al v. 7, con due coppie di nomi in ciascuna delle quali i due membri sono collegati dal *waw* e in cui i due secondi membri terminano in *îm* creando assonanza. Segue al v. 8a un accelerare del ritmo, con tre nomi

⁽¹⁾ Cfr. anche l'argomentazione di HIRSCH: «The separating accent in *מִשְׁנֵאִיד*, *אֹיְבֵיךָ* (Verse 3) and in *עַל עַמְּךָ* (Verse 4) lays stress on the pronoun in these words. In the final analysis, the fight of Israel's enemies is not directed against us but against «Thee»; that is, against God Himself»: S. R. HIRSCH, *The Psalms* (Jerusalem 1978) 94-95.

uniti tra loro dal *waw* a cui fa seguito un diverso modo di elencazione: prima due nomi collegati da un *עם* (v. 8b), poi un solo nome preceduto da *גם* e seguito da una descrizione (v. 9).

Questo elenco di nemici chiude la prima parte del Salmo e insieme prepara l'elenco di altri nemici — riferiti ora esplicitamente alla storia passata di Israele — che compare all'inizio della seconda parte del Salmo.

Questa si apre con una ripresa della supplica a Dio iniziata al v. 2, ma questa volta espressa in positivo: *עשה להם* (v. 10); tale imperativo prosegue lungo il Salmo con i due *שיתמו* dei vv. 12 e 14, due *yiqtol* ingiuntivi *תהלהם* e *תדרפם* al v. 16 e un ultimo imperativo *מלא* al v. 17. Al v. 14, dove il secondo *שיתמו* — come vedremo — inizia un nuovo discorso rispetto ai versetti precedenti, viene inserito il vocativo *אלהי* che riprende i due vocativi *אלהים* e *אל* del v. 2.

I vv. 10-12, come è stato detto, si riferiscono a esempi della storia passata di Israele che fungono da punto di riferimento per l'attività presente richiesta a Dio. Tale richiesta si articola in due tempi (... *עשה להם כ...*, v. 10; ...*כ...* *שיתמו*, v. 12) seguiti rispettivamente dalle descrizioni della sorte dei nemici passati (v. 11) e della situazione di quelli presenti (v. 13)⁽²⁾. Lo schema che ne risulta è perciò il seguente:

- v. 10: nomi di nemici
- v. 11: situazione passata
- v. 12: nomi di nemici
- v. 13: situazione presente

Il v. 13 chiude questa prima sezione della seconda parte del Salmo in parallelo con il v. 5 della prima parte (*אמר*, v. 5 → *אשר אמרו*, v. 13). Le intenzioni contro Israele espresse dai nemici attuali del popolo in questi due versetti si chiarificano così a vicenda e acquistano connotazione blasfema: lo scopo e il senso ultimo della distruzione di Israele fino ad eliminarne persino il ricordo (v. 5) è di giungere ad un suo soppiantamento radicale all'interno della sua stessa Alleanza con Dio (v. 13: ... *נדרשה לנו*)⁽³⁾.

⁽²⁾ In questo v. 13, la proposizione relativa *אשר אמרו* si riferisce ai termini che immediatamente la precedono, cioè i *כל נסיכמו* (v. 12) che sono i capi della coalizione che sta attualmente minacciando Israele e che si chiede siano resi come i capi dei Madianiti sconfitti. Si noti, a proposito di tale richiesta, la forma chiasmica del v. 12.

⁽³⁾ Per il senso di *ירש* in questo contesto, cfr. più avanti, p. 527-528.

Con il secondo שיתמו si passa, nel v. 14, a un diverso tipo di esempi cui l'attività di Dio verso i popoli ostili può ispirarsi. Si tratta di esempi tratti da fenomeni distruttivi naturali: il vento che disperde la paglia, il fuoco che distrugge i boschi sui monti. Compaiono termini paralleli o comunque ben relazionati tra loro: קש e גלגל (v. 14), אש e להבה, יער e חרים (v. 15).

Anche nel v. 16, costruito in forma chiastica, sono degli elementi dell'ambiente naturale (סופה e סער) che servono a esprimere l'intervento sgominante di Dio nei confronti dei nemici e ne sono anzi gli strumenti.

Con l'ultimo imperativo del v. 17 entriamo nella parte finale del Salmo: l'azione di Dio contro le nazioni coalizzate deve portare il suo effetto che si connota secondo due direttrici semantiche, una negativa e l'altra positiva, che si alternano in un movimento di ampliamento: vergogna-smarrimento-perdizione (vv. 17a.18; 18 amplia 17a) e ricerca-riconoscimento della verità di Dio (vv. 17b.19; 19 amplia 17b). Si giunge così a quell'affermazione su Dio (v. 19) che è la logica espressione e conseguenza del suo uscire da quel silenzio passivo — cui si fa riferimento all'inizio del Salmo (v. 2) — che avrebbe altrimenti finito per negarlo come Dio.

II. Analisi semantica

A. Prima Parte

v. 2

Come già segnalato, il Salmo si apre con una richiesta pressante, tre volte ripetuta, che Dio non si tenga in disparte e non rinunci ad intervenire in una questione che lo riguarda tanto da vicino. I termini usati per tale richiesta sono molto significativi.

1) דמי è parola rara, un *trislegomenon*, la cui radice verbale דמה implica, nell'uso intransitivo del *Qal*, l'idea di cessazione di un'attività, interruzione, riposo⁽⁴⁾. Le altre due occorrenze del sostantivo vanno chiaramente in questa linea: Is 62,6.7.

2) Anche il verbo חרש (*Qal*: essere sordo, muto) è poco usato,

⁽⁴⁾ Cfr. KB: *still sein, zur Ruhe kommen*; R. ALCALAY, *The Complete Hebrew — English Dictionary* (Ramat Gan — Jerusalem 1963): *to cease, stop*; F. BROWN - S. R. DRIVER - C. A. BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1977): *to cease*; W. GESenius, *Hebräi-*

solo 7 volte, ma è interessante notare che, di queste 7 occorrenze, 6 hanno Dio per soggetto e appartengono al libro dei Salmi. L'unica occorrenza estranea è Mi 7,16. Vale la pena di percorrere brevemente i testi dei Salmi che usano questo verbo, per ricavarne alcune indicazioni semantiche; si tratta di Sal 28,1; 35,22; 39,13; 50,3; 109,1.

- 28,1-2: stessa richiesta del Sal 83, con l'aggiunta di un מְמַי. Il verbo חָרַשׁ qui sembra mantenere la doppia connotazione di sordità e mutismo insieme, inserito com'è tra i verbi קָרָא, חָשָׂה e שָׁמַע: al gridare (קָרָא) del salmista Dio deve dare risposta non essendo sordo (שָׁמַע), che si pone perciò come antonimo di חָרַשׁ e non restando muto (חָשָׂה, qui sinonimo di חָרַשׁ)⁽⁵⁾. Il contesto è anche qui di richiesta di intervento punitivo contro i nemici, connotati come empì, malfattori, bugiardi (vv. 3-5). L'intervento di Dio si presenta come assolutamente necessario, unica possibilità di salvezza per il salmista e per il popolo. Davanti a tale situazione di indigenza, che grida a un passo ormai dalla fine, Dio non può rimanere sordo e muto. Se questo avvenisse, non resterebbe che scendere nella fossa (v. 1), ma è pro-

sches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament (Leipzig 1921): *sich beruhigen*; F. ZORELL, *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum Veteris Testamenti* (Roma 1968): *cessavit*. Questa radice verbale, come il sostantivo, è poco usata e a volte con significato incerto. Per il senso di cessazione, riposo, cfr. Ger 14,17 e Lam 3,49.

(5) Gli studiosi, nel tradurre, restano divisi tra sordità e mutismo. Traducono con termini indicanti sordità: L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Salmos y Cánticos del Breviario* (Madrid 1977) 78; W. E. BARNES, *The Psalms* (2 vol.; London 1931) I, 140; G. CASTELLINO, *Libro dei Salmi* (Torino 1955) 96; F. DELITZSCH, *Die Psalmen* (Biblische Kommentar über das Alte Testament IV, 1; Leipzig 1894) 242; H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen* (Göttingen 1968) 118; L. JACQUET, *Les Psaumes et le cœur de l'homme* (3 vol.; Gembloux 1975-1979) I, 622; E. J. KISSANE, *The Book of Psalms* (2 vol.; Dublin 1953-1954) I, 122; A. MAILLOT - A. LELIÈVRE, *Les Psaumes* (3 vol.; Genève 1961-1969) I, 175; M. MANNATI, *Les Psaumes* (4 vol.; Paris 1966-1968) I, 269; W. O. E. OESTERLEY, *The Psalms* (London 1962) 198; E. PODECHARD, *Le Psautier* (2 vol.; Lyon 1949-1954) I, 133. Traducono con espressioni riferite al mutismo: E. BEAUCAMP, *Le Psautier* (2 vol.; SB; Paris 1976-1979) I; M. DAHOOD, *Psalms* (3 vol.; AB 16-17A; Garden City, NY, 1966-1970) I, 171; A. GONZALEZ, *El libro de los Salmos* (Biblioteca Herder 73; Barcelona 1966) 149; A. F. KIRKPATRICK, *The Book of Psalms* (Cambridge 1903) 144; R. KITTEL, *Die Psalmen* (KAT XIII; Leipzig 1922) 108; H. J. KRAUS, *Psalmen* (2 vol.; BKAT XV; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) I, 371; A. WEISER, *Die Psalmen* (2 vol.; ATD 14-15; Göttingen 1950) I, 162. (N.B.: Le opere citate in questa nota verranno d'ora in poi indicate con il solo nome dell'autore).

prio la profondità del בור da cui sale il grido che garantisce l'adeguata risposta di Dio in quanto unica salvezza.

- 35,22: ancora un Salmo contro i nemici, con chiare connotazioni giudiziali: ריב (vv. 1.23), קום (vv. 2.11), עדים (v. 11), שאל (v. 11), משפט (v. 23), שפט כצדק (v. 24) e anche, nel v. 22 in questione, il ראה investigativo di Dio, in opposizione a quello accusatore (v. 21) dei nemici bugiardi (v. 19). Compaiono lungo il Salmo termini e immagini che si ritrovano anche nel Sal 83, per lo più comuni al frasario imprecatório. Così, i verbi בוש e חפר (vv. 4.26), l'immagine della pula (מץ) in balla del vento (v. 5), il verbo רדף (con soggetto יהוה מלאך in v. 6), שנא e אויב (v. 19), אמרו che introduce le frasi dei nemici (v. 21). La situazione è, come nel Salmo precedente, di un estremo pericolo dal quale solo Dio può salvare uscendo dal silenzio⁽⁶⁾ e intervenendo attivamente a ristabilire quella giustizia della quale Egli è l'unico garante.

- 39,13: lamento di un uomo giunto ormai ad un punto-limite. La supplica si conclude con la richiesta a Dio di prestare ascolto al lamento dell'orante e permettergli un po' di sollievo prima della fine. Il verbo חרש viene usato insieme con i verbi שמע e האזין, acquistando così connotazione di sordità. Ma non è escluso, anche se in forma minore, il senso di mutismo⁽⁷⁾, in rapporto all'atteggiamento del salmista: questi tace (vv. 2-3.10) e quando parla (v. 4) le sue parole sono preghiera, lamento e pianto (v. 13). Questo silenzio e questa supplica Dio deve dunque ascoltare, ma per dare risposta. Il gioco semantico è tra i due atteggiamenti dei due protagonisti: il salmista tace e prega, che Dio ascolti la preghiera e risponda non tacendo.

- 50,3: il contesto è di teofania e giudizio: Dio convoca il popolo e pone l'atto di accusa⁽⁸⁾. Il suo non tacere⁽⁹⁾ — solo qui affer-

⁽⁶⁾ Tutti gli autori citati nella nota precedente traducono il חרש del v. 22 con idea di mutismo, silenzio, tranne MAILLOT-LELIÈVRE che fanno riferimento alla sordità: «ne reste pas sourd» (I, 218).

⁽⁷⁾ Rendono il verbo con idea di mutismo e silenzio: DELITZSCH, 302; KITTEL, 142; KRAUS, I, 451; WEISER, I, 211. Anche KIRKPATRICK, 206, sembra andare in questa linea traducendo con «hold not thy peace», ma poi in nota precisa: «the word may be rendered... be not deaf».

⁽⁸⁾ Per l'analisi del Salmo e il suo rapporto con il Sal 51, rimandiamo allo studio di L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Treinta Salmos: poesía y oración* (Madrid 1981) 189-230.

⁽⁹⁾ Tutti gli autori citati in precedenza sono concordi su questo senso del verbo חרש in questo Salmo.

mato, a differenza degli altri testi del Salterio che usano tale verbo in 2ª persona, come richiesta — è parte integrante della teofania, in quanto espressione chiara di intervento attivo di Dio per il ristabilimento della verità nei confronti del popolo e la manifestazione della propria santità (cfr. anche l'uso di חרש in *Hiphil* al v. 21).

— 109,1: ancora una richiesta a Dio di intervenire contro la palese malvagità e ingiustizia dei nemici del salmista. All'ormai nota formula אל תחרש fa seguito al v. 2 la motivazione introdotta dal כי: contro l'innocente si aprono פי רשע e פי מרמה, si scagliano לשון שקר e דברי שנאה (v. 3). Il campo semantico del parlare si estende anche al verbo חרש: Dio non può rimanere in silenzio davanti al malvagio che alza la sua voce di menzogna contro un innocente. Alle parole dell'empio deve opporsi la parola di verità e la sentenza di Dio che faccia infine giustizia. Questo non tacere suppone d'altra parte l'aver udito le parole dell'ingiusto e il lamento dell'innocente: Dio interviene uscendo dal silenzio perché non può rimanere sordo al grido dell'oppressione⁽¹⁰⁾.

Dall'uso nei testi visti, il verbo חרש risulta dunque connotato come un atteggiamento di rifiuto di prendere atto della realtà e conseguentemente di intervenire per giudicarla e modificarla. Tale rifiuto si esprime insieme nel non udire e non parlare, estraniandosi perciò totalmente dalla situazione ed evitando ogni coinvolgimento. La richiesta a Dio di non comportarsi così — il cui ovvio contesto è la situazione giudiziale e di lamento — è il senso pregnante che emerge anche nel Sal 83 che stiamo esaminando e che presenta la stessa sovrapposizione degli elementi di mutismo e di sordità⁽¹¹⁾: davanti agli eventi che si vanno preparando, Dio non deve rimanere in silenzio quasi fosse sordo al clamore che si leva contro di Lui e contro il suo popolo. Il suo agire contro i nemici, come gli viene richiesto nella seconda parte del Salmo, sarà l'espressione adeguata della sua parola di giudizio su di essi.

3) Il terzo verbo situato all'inizio del nostro Salmo, il *Qal* di שקט, benché sia usato molto più frequentemente dei due precedenti, ha però sempre altri soggetti diversi da Dio tranne che in due soli

⁽¹⁰⁾ Traducono חרש con termini riferiti a sordità: DAHOOD, III, 97; MANNATI, IV, 26.

⁽¹¹⁾ Traducono secondo questa seconda connotazione: MAILLOT-LELIÈVRE, II, 198; MANNATI, III, 106.

casi, Is 18,4 ed Ez 16,42⁽¹²⁾. Il senso è sicuro, dell'ordine dello stare in pace, rimanere calmo, stare tranquillo; l'antonimo molto significativo, in Ez 16, è il verbo כָּעַס.

Tali atteggiamenti di calma e di indifferenza dunque non si addicono a Dio davanti alla situazione che il salmista si appresta a descrivere: con l'introduzione כִּי הִנֵּה comincia la presentazione del caso dei vv. 3-9.

vv. 3-6.13

L'attività dei popoli contro Dio e contro Israele si presenta massiccia, pericolosamente rumorosa, con accenti drammaticamente blasfemi. I verbi usati delineano una situazione di complotto e di accordo intorno a uno scopo preciso di distruzione di Israele come popolo. Ma il gioco dei termini e dei suffissi precisa che tale intento è in realtà indirizzato contro Dio.

Ho già accennato all'accurata struttura di questi versetti e al loro senso globale in quella direzione. Vediamone ora più da vicino le connessioni e le implicazioni di significato.

I verbi che vengono usati, oltre a fare contrasto con quelli precedentemente riferiti a Dio⁽¹³⁾, sembrano alludere e richiamare la terminologia dell'Alleanza⁽¹⁴⁾ fino a farne menzione esplicita al v. 6. Ma si tratta di un'alleanza tra nazioni il cui intento è proprio di eliminare l'unico popolo dell'unica vera Alleanza. Questo è detto chiaramente al v. 5: si tratta di cancellare Israele e non farlo più esistere come nazione: וַנְּחַדֶּם מִגֵּי. Ma proprio qui è l'equivoco. Israele non è un גֵּי come gli altri, ma עַם di Dio (v. 4a), suoi צַדִּיקִים (v. 4b) ed ogni attentato alla sua esistenza è un attentato all'esistenza stessa di Dio. L'Alleanza contratta da Dio con Israele ha ormai posto una situazione irreversibile; che YHWH voglia essere il Dio di Israele implica che Egli si impegna a far vivere il popolo che si è scelto, la sua elezione è garanzia di sopravvivenza per il popolo di Israele la cui esistenza è ormai inestricabilmente congiunta con quella del Dio al quale appartiene e della cui rivelazione è stato fatto depositario e mediatore⁽¹⁵⁾.

⁽¹²⁾ Non consideriamo qui Ger 47,6.7 il cui soggetto è חֶרֶב יְהוָה.

⁽¹³⁾ Cfr. soprattutto JACQUET, II, 610; MANNATI, III, 110, n. 11; OESTERLEY, 377.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cfr. MANNATI, III, 110-111.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Affrontando il problema delle imprecazioni nei Salmi di lamentazio-

È dunque a motivo dell'Alleanza che Israele non può perire, pena il coinvolgimento di Dio stesso nel disastro (cfr. Num 14,15-16). Un eventuale annientamento di Israele da parte di nazioni nemiche potrebbe solo significare o che Dio è volontariamente venuto meno alla sua Alleanza, o che è troppo debole per garantirla: in ambedue i casi, Dio verrebbe negato come Dio, la sua identità e verità di Dio fedele ed unico verrebbe irrimediabilmente compromessa⁽¹⁶⁾. Perciò il Salmo può affermare *עלֵךְ בְּרִית יִכְרְתוּ* (v. 6b) a proposito di nemici che si alleano *עַל עֵמֶךְ* (v. 4a) e perciò sono *אֹיְבֶיךָ* e *מִשְׁנָאֶיךָ* (v. 3), e in tal modo congiunge Dio e popolo e non pone distinzione tra loro in quanto oggetto dell'aggressione nemica.

Questa unificazione di oggetti, il loro convergere sotto le mire degli empi, di cui certamente Israele è consapevole, viene posto anche alla base del comportamento dei nemici così come nel Salmo è descritto. Il complotto delle nazioni vi assume infatti una connotazione di contro-Alleanza, in un tentativo blasfemo di stravolgimento della realtà. La formula *כֵּת בְּרִית* viene qui usata — ed è l'unico caso nella Bibbia — con la preposizione avversativa *עַל* e proprio in riferimento a Dio: la *בְּרִית* tra i popoli è contro il Dio legato dalla sua *בְּרִית* al popolo che si sta tentando di distruggere.

La connessione del v. 5 con il v. 13 chiarisce ulteriormente questo intento: l'eliminazione del popolo di Israele (v. 5) è per espro-

ne, Worden puntualizza, a proposito della necessità della sopravvivenza di Israele: «... the choice of Israel by God constitutes the essential means whereby God has decided to make Himself known to the world... The semitic philosopher might go so far as to say that God's existence depends upon the existence of Israel, because for the Semite existence was inextricably bound up with the knowledge or recognition of existence»: T. WORDEN, *The Psalms are christian Prayer* (New York 1961) 148. Cfr. anche il commento del *Midrash* al v. 5 del nostro Salmo: «כל זמן שישראל קיימן הוא נקרא אלהי ישראל, נעקר ישראל אלהי מי נקרא» («finché Israele esiste, Egli è chiamato Dio-d'-Israele, ma se Israele viene distrutto, Dio-di-chi è chiamato?»): *Midr. Salmi*, 185.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Non si prende qui in considerazione la possibilità che sia il popolo a sottrarsi al rapporto di Alleanza e a fare perciò esso stesso una scelta autodistruttiva. Il Salmo dà per scontata la pienezza di relazione tra Dio e il popolo della sua elezione e non si pone il problema di una possibile divergenza di interessi. Ma comunque, anche in caso di infedeltà del popolo, questo resterebbe nonostante tutto il popolo eletto, infedele nella sua elezione ma pur sempre e irrevocabilmente segnato dalla scelta operata da Dio nei suoi confronti, con tutte le conseguenze che questo comporta per la sua identità e la sua esistenza, compresa l'impossibilità di un suo venir meno totale.

priarlo e prendere così possesso dei suoi territori che sono quelli che Dio gli aveva donato (v. 13). Fa da chiave di lettura, qui, l'uso nel v. 13 del verbo ירש e dell'espressione נאות אלהים. Quest'ultima è *hapax*, ma il termine נאות è ben attestato, compare altre 11 volte⁽¹⁷⁾ al plurale e in catena costruita con termini diversi di cui il più frequente è מדבר⁽¹⁸⁾. Sta ad indicare i luoghi di pascolo dove pastori e greggi dimorano e trovano pastura. L'idea soggiacente è generalmente di fertilità, o espressa esplicitamente (ירשאו נאות מדבר: Gioele 2,22; נאות: Sal 23,2; ירעפו נאות מדבר: Sal 65,13) o evocata dalla sua negazione (cfr. soprattutto Ger 23,10: יבשו נאות מדבר; Am 1,2: ואכלו נאות) (הרעים)⁽¹⁹⁾. Nel nostro testo tutto questo è connesso con Dio: si tratta dei suoi pascoli, che Egli ha donato al suo gregge, il popolo di Israele, perché vi pascoli sotto la sua guida⁽²⁰⁾. In altri termini, queste נאות אלהים sono ארץ יהוה (Os 9,3), la Terra Promessa in cui tutto dice fertilità perché dono di Dio e condizione inalienabile di esistenza, pegno indissolubile dell'Alleanza.

A ciò si connette il verbo ירש, con tutto il suo spessore semantico, fortemente evocativo. Esso indica infatti la presa di possesso di una proprietà altrui, sia che questo avvenga per diritto che ingiustamente⁽²¹⁾; ma quando si tratta del possesso della terra della Promessa, questo può avvenire solo per mandato del Signore e spetta al solo Israele, erede della Promessa⁽²²⁾. È allora un prendere possesso che è in realtà un accogliere un dono, ricevere da un Altro e gratuitamente, senza alcun merito proprio, solo in virtù della parola data da Dio ai Padri del popolo⁽²³⁾. Un possedere, dunque, che si basa e si giustifica solo sull'Alleanza e che perciò spetta al solo popolo scelto. Chiunque tentasse di inserirsi in questa situazione di possedimen-

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ger 9,9; 23,10; 25,37; Gioele 1,19.20; 2,22; Am 1,2; Sal 23,2; 65,13; 74,20; Lam 2,2.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Ger 9,9; 23,10; Gioele 1,19.20; 2,22; Sal 65,13.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cfr. ALCALAY, 1566, che traduce l'espressione נאות מדבר con «oasis».

⁽²⁰⁾ Cfr. Ez 34,14-15.31; Ger 23,3; 50,19; Sal 95,7; 100,3; Mi 7,14; Zacc 9,16.

⁽²¹⁾ Cfr. ZORELL, 332: «cum acc. rei: accepit (*cepit*, *occupavit* etc.) id quod alius possidebat, sive id fecit iustissime vel mandato divino, sive (pro contextu) iniuste, vi, fraude». Cfr., tra i molti testi, Num 13,30; 27,11; 36,8; Deut 2,12; 4,22; 1 Re 21,15-19; Ez 7,24; 36,12.

⁽²²⁾ Cfr. Lev 20,24; Deut 1,8.21; 10,11; Am 2,10; Neem 9,15.23-25; etc.

⁽²³⁾ Cfr. Deut 9,4-6; Gios 21,43-45; Sal 44,2-4.

to, starebbe in realtà inserendosi nel rapporto di Alleanza in un tentativo di sostituzione indebita e blasfema che vuole impadronirsi di ciò che può essere invece solo accettato come dono⁽²⁴⁾. Questo è appunto ciò che tentano di fare i nemici di Israele del nostro Salmo. Nel loro *לנו נירשה* riferito alla terra di Dio, è implicito ed evocato un radicale stravolgimento di rapporti tra Dio, Israele e gli altri popoli suoi nemici, che dà alla pretesa un sapore molto più violento e dissacratorio di quanto non si trovi normalmente in una semplice intenzione di conquista. Ciò che è in gioco qui è l'Alleanza in tutta la sua estensione e in tutte le sue conseguenze.

In questo contesto, anche l'espressione *עוד שם ישראל* del v. 5b acquista significato pregnante e la possibilità di un doppio strato semantico: non solo l'eliminazione in generale del ricordo di Israele (*Niphal* di *זכר* come impersonale), ma anche il suo cadere dal ricordo stesso di Dio (*Niphal* come passivo teologico). Non si tratterebbe allora solo della cancellazione e distruzione di Israele come popolo, significata, come in altri testi, dalla sparizione del suo nome dalla memoria degli uomini⁽²⁵⁾, ma in questo si esprimerebbe quel «dimenticare» di Dio che è la rottura dell'Alleanza. Dio infatti è colui il cui ricordare è causa di salvezza⁽²⁶⁾, colui che ricorda sempre il suo Patto⁽²⁷⁾ e, conservando la memoria del suo popolo, lo salva dalla distruzione e ne garantisce l'esistenza per sempre⁽²⁸⁾. Se perciò Egli non dovesse ricordare più Israele, per quest'ultimo sarebbe la fine e insieme anche quella di Dio.

Questo è ciò che soggiace e anima il progetto dei nemici nella loro volontà di eliminazione di Israele per impossessarsi della sua eredità. E questo è ciò che li porta alla stipulazione di una *ברית* (v. 6) contratta — in un paradosso drammaticamente ironico — proprio contro quel Dio che è il primario contraente e l'unico garante dell'unica *ברית* capace di condurre all'esistenza. Il gioco delle parti risulta in tal modo completamente sconvolto: Israele, l'eternamente

⁽²⁴⁾ Questo è sempre vero, anche per lo stesso Israele: cfr. Ez 33,23-29.

⁽²⁵⁾ Cfr. Es 17,14; Deut 25,19; 32,26; Ger 11,19 (dove ricorre lo stesso sintagma del nostro testo e anch'esso in contesto imprecatório: cfr. v. 20); Ez 21,37; 25,10; Sal 9,6-7; 34,17; 109,15; Giob 18,17.

⁽²⁶⁾ Cfr., tra gli altri testi, Gen 9,15-16; 19,29; Es 2,24-25; 6,5-8; Giud 16,28; Ger 31,20; Sal 9,13; 115,12; 119,49; Giob 14,13; Neem 13,14.22.32.

⁽²⁷⁾ Cfr. soprattutto Deut 4,31; Ez 16,60; Sal 105,8-9; 111,5b.

⁽²⁸⁾ Cfr. particolarmente Es 32,11-14; Num 10,9; Lev 26,44-45; Is 49, 14-17; Ger 14,21; Sal 74,1-2.19-20; 106,44-46; 136,23-24.

vivo a motivo della fedeltà di Dio, sarebbe invece distrutto; i popoli si impadronirebbero di un possesso che di sua natura è solo possibile accogliere nell'Alleanza; l'Alleanza verrebbe annullata da un altro patto, e Dio sostituito dalla volontà blasfema di un'aggressione violenta e senza memoria.

Con questa nota di tragica contraddizione, si inizia la lista dei nomi dei popoli nemici.

vv. 7-9.

Dei dieci nemici elencati, quasi tutti presentano nella loro storia delle caratteristiche di opposizione esplicita al Dio d'Israele e di tentativi di capovolgimento della situazione di Alleanza, nella linea di quanto detto sopra. Rimandiamo ai vari commentatori per la identificazione e collocazione storico-geografica dei singoli popoli, limitandoci qui a sottolineare quella caratterizzazione di pretesa «anti-Dio» che sembra, in un modo o nell'altro, accomunarli⁽²⁹⁾.

Li esamineremo dunque brevemente, nel loro ordine di apparizione nel testo.

Edom: rifiuta di far passare per il proprio territorio Israele che viaggiava nel deserto dopo l'uscita dall'Egitto (Num 20,14-21; Giud 11,16-17); in tal modo, costringe Israele ad un allungamento del cammino che rende ancora più insostenibile il viaggio e porta gli Israeliti all'esasperazione e alla mormorazione contro Dio, con il conseguente castigo dei serpenti (Num 21,4ss.). Popolo arrogante e superbo (Ger 49,16; Abd 2-4), «regione empia e popolo contro cui il Signore è adirato per sempre» (Mal 1,4c), partecipò, godendone, alla distruzione di Gerusalemme, la città santa di Dio e luogo della sua abitazione (Ez 25,12; Abd 9-15; Sal 137,7). Di esso è detto esplicitamente, insieme con Moab e Ammon, che il suo tentativo di scacciare Israele dalla terra avuta in eredità da Dio è guerra che riguarda Dio stesso (2 Cron 20,10-12.15. Nota l'uso della radice ירש nel v. 11). I suoi interventi contro il popolo eletto hanno dunque la connotazione tipica della rivolta contro Dio, in un intento definitivamente esplicito di soppiantamento di Dio stesso: יען אמרך את שני הגוים ואת שתי הארצות לי תהיינה וירשונה ויהוה שם היה (Ez 35,10. Cfr. tutto il capi-

⁽²⁹⁾ Per questo stesso motivo, faremo riferimento solo ad alcuni dei testi biblici che riguardano i popoli in questione, e non sempre ai più importanti, limitandoci a quelli che più da vicino toccano la problematica in esame.

tolo, soprattutto i vv. 12-15. Nota anche qui, nel v. 10, l'uso del verbo (ירש).

Ismaeliti: discendenti di quell'Ismaele figlio di Agar che sembrava rappresentare una minaccia per Isacco, figlio della Promessa, e perciò per la Promessa stessa di Dio ad Abramo: cfr. Gen 16; 21; 25,12-18.

Moab: rifiutò anch'esso, insieme con Edom, il passaggio agli Israeliti che uscivano dall'Egitto (Giud 11,17-18) e cercò di corrompere Balaam perché maledicesse Israele contro il volere di Dio (Num 22-24); per questo e per non aver aiutato Israele nel suo cammino nel deserto, i Moabiti, insieme con gli Ammoniti, non potranno mai far parte del קהל יהוה (Deut 23,4-6; Neem 13,1-2). Popolo anch'esso orgoglioso e superbo (Is 16,6; Ger 48,29), con Edom e Ammon ha combattuto contro Dio (2 Cron 20,10-12.15)⁽³⁰⁾; levatosi contro Israele, ne ha fatto l'oggetto del suo insulto e del suo scherno (Ger 48,27; Sof 2,8.10) e così facendo si è innalzato contro Dio (Ger 48,26.42). Perciò, è popolo votato alla rovina (Ger 48,2; Ez 25,8-11; Sof 2,9; ecc.)⁽³¹⁾.

Agareni: i discendenti di Agar, la madre di Ismaele (cfr. sopra quanto detto sugli Ismaeliti).

Gebal: di identificazione contrastata, sembra essere tra i territori della conquista da effettuare perché la Promessa si realizzi (cfr. Gios 13,1-6).

Ammon: come già visto, è annoverato con Edom e Moab tra i popoli che hanno combattuto contro Dio nel tentativo di scacciare Israele dalla sua proprietà (2 Cron 20,10-12.15. Vedi sopra), è coinvolto con Moab nell'impossibilità di entrare a far parte del קהל יהוה a motivo del mancato aiuto dagli Israeliti usciti dall'Egitto e della tentata corruzione di Balaam contro di essi (cfr. sopra i testi già citati a questo proposito per Moab) e verrà con Moab distrutto per aver insultato ed essersi levato contro il popolo di Dio (Sof 2,8-10). Anch'esso ha goduto della distruzione di Gerusalemme e del Santuario di Dio e perciò verrà annientato (Ez 25,2-7)⁽³²⁾.

⁽³⁰⁾ Cfr. quanto detto sopra, a questo proposito, su Edom.

⁽³¹⁾ Notare, in Ger 48,2, la terminologia che richiama quella usata nel nostro Salmo a proposito della tentata distruzione di Israele: לכו ונכרייתנה מגוי. Da notare anche, per lo stesso motivo, il v. 10 di Ez 25: ...בגוים. לא תזכר. riferito forse ad Ammon ma più probabilmente a Moab, a seconda dell'interpretazione testuale.

⁽³²⁾ Di tale annientamento si parla anche in Ez 21,37 con l'espressione,

Amaleq: nemico tipico di Israele, dovrà essere annientato e il suo ricordo cancellato⁽³³⁾ per quanto fatto contro Israele nel suo cammino dall'Egitto (Es 17,8-16; Deut 25,17-19). Questa aggressione contro il popolo di Dio nel momento in cui Dio lo guidava per fare salvezza e che si risolve in un «non temere Dio» (ולא ירא אלהים; Deut 25,18), è alla base del comando di sterminio totale degli Amaleciti rivolto anche a Saul (1 Sam 15,2-3) e che mostra tutta la sua gravità nel momento in cui Saul, sottraendovisi, incorre nel rigetto da parte di Dio (1 Sam 15,10-11.18-19.23.26-29).

Filistei: è questo il nemico tradizionale di Israele, che nella sua storia è stato protagonista dell'impossibile: far prigioniero Dio, catturando l'Arca (1 Sam 4). Anche per esso il destino è la distruzione, sotto la vendetta di Dio, per essersi esso vendicato contro il popolo (Ez 25,15-17) e contro Dio stesso (Gioele 4,4).

Tiro: città prospera e orgogliosa (Is 23,8-9; Ez 27,25), il suo re si è spinto fino a credersi Dio (Ez 28,1-10). Ha dimenticato l'alleanza dei fratelli (Am 1,9), si è presa la rivincita contro Dio, insieme con Sidone e i Filistei (Gioele 4,4), ha goduto della fine di Gerusalemme (Ez 26,2) e perciò sarà distrutta.

Assiria: ultimo popolo della lista, è il potente impero che ha posto fine all'esistenza del Regno di Israele (2 Re 17,1-6; 18,9-12) e attentato a quello di Giuda (2 Re 18,13-19,37; 2 Cron 32; Is 36-37). In questa occasione, la sua empietà trova espressione in una pretesa di potere assolutizzante e in un atteggiamento di disprezzo esplicito di Dio (2 Re 18,28-35; 19,10-13; 2 Cron 32,9-19; Is 36,4-20; 37,10-13) che viene definito לחרף אלהים (2 Re 19,4; cfr. anche vv. 22-23 e i paralleli in Is). Potenza superba e piena di orgoglio (Is 10,12-14; Ez 31,10; Sof 2,15; Zacc 10,11), ha tramato il male contro Dio (Nah 1,11) e sarà distrutta (cfr. soprattutto Nahum)⁽³⁴⁾.

interessante per noi in rapporto al nostro Salmo, לא תזכרי. Segnaliamo qui l'altrettanto interessante uso del verbo ירש in testi che trattano dell'attività aggressiva di Ammon nei confronti di Israele: cfr. Giud 11,23-24; Ger 49,1.

⁽³³⁾ Notare anche qui la terminologia: מוחה את זכר מתחת השמים (cfr. Es 17,14; Deut 25,19).

⁽³⁴⁾ Non esaminiamo qui, per ragioni di spazio, la sua pur interessante caratterizzazione di potenza mostruosa e blasfema come appare in Giuditta, soprattutto ai capp. 6 e 9, e tutta la problematica soggiacente al libro di Giona.

Possiamo dunque concludere che in linea di massima nella storia di questi popoli è presente un elemento di rivolta contro Dio e di attentato al suo piano di salvezza. Per essi, la lotta contro Israele non è solo lotta contro un popolo, ma finisce sempre, prima o poi, per coinvolgere un elemento di contrapposizione a Dio, che nel nostro Salmo trova espressione pienamente esplicita.

Così, con tale lista di popoli nemici di Israele e di Dio, si chiude — con il סלה finale — la prima parte del Salmo.

B. Seconda Parte

La seconda parte del Salmo riprende la richiesta di intervento rivolta a Dio che aveva aperto il Salmo stesso al v. 2. Ma mentre lì tale richiesta si esprimeva in forma negativa, ora la preghiera assume formulazione positiva e carattere di azione. Come per i nemici le parole (vv. 5.13) esprimono intenti precisi e corrispondono a degli atti (vv. 3-4.6), così anche nei confronti di Dio la richiesta di non tacere (v. 2) diventa, lungo tutta la seconda parte del Salmo, domanda positiva di «fare» qualcosa: עשה (v. 10), שיתמו (vv. 12.14), תרדפם (v. 16), תבהלם (v. 16), מלא (v. 17). La fine del silenzio di Dio è azione concreta che sgomina i suoi oppositori, rappresentati — in questa parte del Salmo — dai loro capi, quasi ad indicare uno scontro ancora più esplicito tra avversari autorevoli e potenti.

vv. 10-12⁽³⁵⁾

L'intervento richiesto a Dio è formulato secondo delle modalità che fanno riferimento alla storia passata di Israele e più precisamente al tempo dei Giudici: si tratta della disfatta dei Cananei ai tempi di Debora (Giud 4-5) e della sconfitta dei Madianiti ad opera di Gedeone (Giud 7-8). Yabin e il suo luogotenente Sisera (v. 10b), e Madian e i suoi capi (vv. 10a.12) diventano «tipi» dei nemici abbattuti di Israele e «tipica» diventa la loro sorte: come fu per loro, così sia adesso per gli aggressori del popolo di Dio. La memoria del passato si fa luogo di invocazione e momento fondamentale della supplica rivolta a Dio. I suoi interventi lungo la storia del popolo sono altrettanti segni della sua fedeltà e della sua capacità a mantener fede all'Alleanza contratta; perciò ci si può basare su di essi per mantenere quella fiducia che sola può far scaturire la preghiera, in un

⁽³⁵⁾ Per il v. 13, vedi sopra, pp. 525-529. Per il problema testuale di v. 11 a, cfr. KISSANE, II, 64.

ricordo del passato che è contemporaneamente farlo ricordare a Dio perché continui a fare salvezza e non contraddica a ciò che è già stato operato⁽³⁶⁾.

In questa prospettiva, le sconfitte di Cananei e Madianiti diventano altrettanti punti di riferimento e modelli per l'agire attuale di Dio, e l'orante può invocare sui nemici di oggi una distruzione analoga a quella dei nemici di ieri suggerendo così delle modalità particolari di intervento di Dio, proprie di quei modelli. Nel nostro caso, gli eventi storici ricordati evocano delle vittorie che, per la debolezza dei loro protagonisti, manifestano in modo inequivocabile la potenza di Dio e indicano in Lui il vero e unico autore di quei successi. Sisera viene ucciso da Jael, una donna, e il suo esercito è sconfitto da Barak e Deborah, un'altra donna⁽³⁷⁾; così anche Madian con tutti i suoi capi è sbaragliato, sotto la guida di Gedeone, da un esercito appositamente ridotto di numero, fino ad un'entità irrisoria, perché non ci fossero dubbi sull'identità del vincitore⁽³⁸⁾.

È Dio che combatte ed è Dio che vince, perché è contro Dio che si muovono i nemici di Israele: gli eventi del passato servono a ribadire ulteriormente la tesi fondamentale del salmista e insistono in quella direzione; ancora una volta, Dio è invitato a prendere coscienza della realtà della situazione e a riconoscersi come il vero destinatario dell'aggressione per agire di conseguenza.

vv. 14-16

Si passa ora dagli esempi della storia alle immagini della natura; i nemici non devono solo risultare sconfitti come avviene in uno scontro militare, ma essere annientati come avviene in certe catastrofi naturali. Il linguaggio da storico diventa metaforico e fa riferimento non più a una storia particolare ma a un'esperienza del cosmo significativa per tutti.

Le immagini si fanno vivide, impressionanti. Dio deve rendere i nemici come la sterpaglia che il vento fa rotolare⁽³⁹⁾ e come la paglia

⁽³⁶⁾ In altri Salmi, in modo ancora più esplicito la memoria del passato ha funzione di convincimento nei confronti di Dio perché intervenga nel presente. Cfr., per es., il movimento di pensiero della supplica nei Salmi 22 e 44.

⁽³⁷⁾ Cfr. le parole di Debora a Barak in Giud 4,9.

⁽³⁸⁾ Cfr. le parole di Dio a Gedeone in Giud 7,2.

⁽³⁹⁾ Sembra essere questo il senso di גלגל che unisce qui l'idea di rotazione propria della sua radice גלל con l'idea di levità dovuta al termine parallelo

sollevata in aria e dispersa (v. 14). È così evocata non solo la distruzione, ma anche il senso dell'assoluta impotenza e vacuità dell'avversario umano davanti alla potenza di Dio, quell'inconsistenza che inevitabilmente si rivela nell'opposizione al divino, quell'essere ridotti in totale balia di una forza che annienta⁽⁴⁰⁾. La paglia non può nulla contro il vento che la solleva, niente può trattenerla a terra e viene inevitabilmente dispersa. Così deve essere, ed è, dei nemici di Dio: la loro apparente forza, il peso schiacciante delle loro aggressioni, il frastuono dei loro eserciti e la pesantezza dei loro progetti e interventi, tutto si riduce all'inconsistente inutilità di una paglia soffiata via da un po' di vento⁽⁴¹⁾.

Nei versetti che seguono, altre immagini si aggiungono: con la stessa violenza con cui il fuoco, avvampando, distrugge le foreste sulle montagne fino a dare l'impressione che il monte tutto intero stia bruciando e consumandosi (v. 15), così Dio deve annientare i popoli avversari con la potenza del suo turbine e della sua tempesta (v. 16). Se nel versetto precedente (il v. 14) era l'inconsistenza del nemico ad essere messa in risalto, qui si tratta invece della violenza inarrestabile dell'ira di Dio paragonata a un fuoco divorante⁽⁴²⁾.

Le diverse immagini si richiamano tra loro per associazione: il vento che solleva la paglia diventa tempesta e turbine, la paglia evoca il fuoco che brucia le stoppie⁽⁴³⁾, e il fuoco richiama il vento che

קש unito alla precisazione לפני רוח. Con la stessa accezione, la parola è usata anche in Is 17,13 dove il termine parallelo è מץ e la precisazione, duplice, ancora più chiarificatrice: לפני רוח, מץ per לפני סופה, מץ per לפני רוח.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Cfr. lo sgomento angoscioso di Giobbe nel sentirsi così esposto davanti a un Dio che sembra infierire contro di lui come un nemico: Giob 12-14, con l'occorrenza del termine (יבש) קש in 13,25.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Altrove il nemico di Dio — sia esso nazione potente, Israele peccatore o l'empio — è definito מץ, pula: cfr. Is 17,13; 29,5; Os 13,3; Sof 2,2; Sal 1,4; 35,5; Giob 21,18. Si tratta di un'immagine molto simile a quella usata nel nostro Salmo, ma che accentua ancora di più l'idea di inconsistenza, inutilità, realtà effimera. In Os 13,3 i termini paralleli (עשן, טל, ענן-בקר) convergono su questa idea precisandola.

⁽⁴²⁾ Per altri testi, cfr. quelli citati alla voce אש sul rapporto tra fuoco e teofania, in *THAT* I, 245-246.

⁽⁴³⁾ Il termine קש ha senso duplice e sta ad indicare sia la paglia che viene separata dal grano con la trebbiatura sia le stoppie che restano nei campi e vengono bruciate. Cfr. alla voce קש, con i testi ivi citati, G. GESENIUS, *The-saurus philologicus criticus Linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaee Veteris Testamenti*, III (Lipsiae 1842) 1244.

lo alimenta. Tutto concorre a dare un'impressione di devastazione e violenza che aggiunge plasticità alla precedente visione dei capi militari sconfitti al tempo dei Giudici. La maledizione della non-sepolitura, che era stata vividamente espressa con il *היו דמן לאדמה* del v. 11, assume dimensioni più vaste di annientamento radicale sotto la violenza del fuoco e del vento impetuoso che tutto distruggono. E Dio viene confessato, nella supplica, Signore incondizionato di tutta la realtà, della storia e del cosmo, vittorioso sui nemici e sulle forze naturali, anzi usando di queste ultime — e nell'immagine poetica quasi trasformato in esse — per consumare la sua vittoria sugli avversari.

vv. 17-19

Come già indicato, in questa parte finale del Salmo l'azione che si richiede a Dio giunge al suo effetto definitivo secondo due linee (vergogna e perdizione dei nemici; ricerca e riconoscimento di Dio) che si presentano in alternanza:

v. 17a: vergogna dei nemici

v. 17b: ricerca di YHWH

v. 18 : perdizione dei nemici

v. 19 : riconoscimento di YHWH.

Il v. 18, con la sua accumulazione di verbi riferentesi alla fine vergognosa dei nemici, esplicita e chiarisce il senso del *קלון* di cui si parla al v. 17a, così come l'idea di riconoscimento dell'identità e unicità di Dio del v. 19 riprende e sviluppa il senso del *שם יהוה בקש* del v. 17b.

I verbi usati nel v. 18 sono quelli usuali della sconfitta: indicano lo stato di confusione, vergogna e rovina di chi viene smascherato e vinto. Il più tipico e maggiormente usato è *בוש*, i cui verbi paralleli più frequenti sono — limitandoci all'ambito del Salterio — i sinonimi *חפר* (unito a *בוש* anche nel nostro Salmo)⁽⁴⁴⁾ e *כלם* (*Ni.*)⁽⁴⁵⁾, e l'espressione *סוג אחור* (*Ni.*)⁽⁴⁶⁾. Il senso che così si esprime è quello dello smascheramento e annientamento, a diversi livelli, e insieme del sentimento di vergogna che lo accompagna⁽⁴⁷⁾. Per meglio capire,

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Cfr. Sal 35,4.26; 40,15; 70,3; 71,24.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Sal 35,4; 40,15; 69,7; 70,3.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Sal 35,4; 40,15; 70,3; 129,5.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ «Als Grundbedeutung im Qal ist "zuschanden werden" anzunehmen, und zwar in doppeltem Sinn: einmal objektiv, den Tatbestand festhaltend

è interessante anche notare la connessione semantica operata, sempre nell'ambito dei Salmi, tra questo verbo e verbi esprimenti fiducia: בָּטַח (Sal 22,6; 25,2), חָסָה (Sal 25,20; 31,2; 71,1), קָוָה (Sal 25,3). L'abbandono fiducioso a Dio salva dalla rovina e non si risolverà mai in motivo di delusione e vergogna; rovina e vergogna sono destinati solo a coloro che da Dio stanno lontani.

Al verbo בָּרַשׁ, nel nostro Salmo, si accompagnano, oltre al sinonimo חָפַר citato sopra, i verbi בָּהַל (*Ni.*)⁽⁴⁸⁾ e אָבַד. Questi esplicitano ulteriormente il senso degli altri due verbi nella linea della disfatta: בָּהַל (*Ni.*) dice lo sgomento, la confusione, la paura, e אָבַד indica qui lo smarrimento, il senso della fine, quell'«essere perduti» che esprime bene l'esperienza della sconfitta. Tutto il v. 18, dunque, richiede per i nemici un intervento che li sgomini e renda evidente la loro incapacità ad opporsi lungamente a Dio: una sconfitta totale, dunque, e per sempre (עַד־עַד).

Eppure, non è questa la richiesta ultima del salmista. Il v. 19 conclude il Salmo appuntando lo sguardo su Dio, così come aveva fatto in apertura (v. 2): ciò che ultimamente è importante è che Dio si manifesti per ciò che è, e che come tale venga riconosciuto. Il riconoscimento della sovranità di Dio è l'ultimo atto della sua vittoria, vi coincide e riguarda tutti, anche i nemici sconfitti: essi stessi, rovinati e vinti — e proprio in quanto tali —, riconosceranno infine che YHWH, e Lui solo, è il vero Dio. Il passo in avanti di questo ultimo versetto rispetto alla tematica del resto del Salmo è dunque evidente: come già visto, l'intervento di Dio in difesa del suo popolo è anche e soprattutto difesa di Se stesso perché svelamento della verità. Ma, ed ecco la novità, questo ristabilimento della verità di Dio non è solo per il suo popolo ma anche per i nemici e si risolve ultimamente anche in loro favore: davanti alla realtà della potenza di Dio e della propria inconsistenza che si rivela nella loro sconfitta, essi ricercheranno il Signore (v. 17b) e diventeranno capaci di riconoscerlo per ciò che è (v. 19).

Anche altrove, nella Bibbia, il riconoscimento di Dio — espresso con la formula... יָדַע כִּי — è risposta dei pagani al dispiegarsi della sua potenza punitiva contro di essi. Così, ad esempio, è per l'Egitto

(“zunichte werden”), aber zugleich subjektiv, das Gefühl des zunichte Gewordenen qualifizierend (“sich schämen”): *THAT* I, 270.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ בָּהַל compare in connessione con בָּרַשׁ anche in Sal 6,11.

(Es 7,5), per Edom (Ez 35,4,9), per Ammon (Ez 25,7), Moab (ib., v. 11), i Filistei (ib., v. 17), i popoli di tutta la terra (Sir 36,1-5; cfr. anche v. 22)⁽⁴⁹⁾. Particolarmente interessante è, a questo proposito, la preghiera di Ezechia in 2 Re 19,14-19//Is 37,14-20. In essa il riconoscimento dell'unicità di Dio (לְבָדֵךְ, cfr. v. 19 del nostro Salmo) da parte dei pagani (כָּל מַמְלָכוֹת הָאָרֶץ) è, come nel Sal 83, collegata con la salvezza operata da Dio nei confronti del suo popolo, ma tutto ciò è in riferimento esplicito all'impossibilità di salvare dimostrata dagli dèi delle nazioni. Se quei popoli sono stati distrutti, infatti, è perché i loro dèi non erano tali, ma solo idoli di legno e pietra e perciò incapaci di liberare i loro adoratori dai nemici; solo chi è il vero Dio può davvero salvare e in tal modo si dimostra la sua verità. Così, il popolo salvato e vittorioso diventa la testimonianza vivente e certa che il suo dio è il vero Dio.

Siamo nel pieno della tematica del nostro Salmo: la sopravvivenza di Israele non è cercata in sé, ma come espressione della unicità di Dio che deve mostrarsi a tutti e da tutti essere riconosciuta. Ma tale riconoscimento ha una sua valenza salvifica, che in qualche modo converte la realtà dei nemici. Allo stesso modo, anche il Sal 2, che ha notevoli punti di contatto con il nostro e lo stesso movimento di pensiero, mette in relazione la vittoria dell'Unto del Signore sugli avversari (vv. 2 → 8-9) con il loro servizio di Dio, ed indica in questo la loro intelligenza e la loro unica possibilità di salvezza (vv. 10-12).

Il nostro Salmo si chiude dunque su questa nota positiva di salvezza e tutto culmina nella proclamazione del vero nome del Signore: il generico אֱלֹהִים (vv. 2.13.14) contro cui i popoli combattono si rivela nella sua vittoria come יְהוָה (vv. 17.19), עליון על כל הארץ (v. 19). Il perdurare del *nome* di Israele, che i nemici — anch'essi elencati per *nome* — vogliono cancellare, porta con sé il perdurare del *nome* di Dio e la sua manifestazione completa: il Dio vittorioso che salva viene riconosciuto come tale sia da Israele salvato che dai nemici sconfitti e si rivela così come l'unico Dio, Signore incondizionato della storia e del mondo⁽⁵⁰⁾.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Si veda anche Dan 3,44-45 (LXX) nei suoi rapporti con i vv. finali del nostro Salmo.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Per il titolo divino עליון, cfr. G. WEHMEIER, עלה, hinaufgehen, *THAT* II. 285-287.

III. La preghiera come imprecazione⁽⁵¹⁾

Il Salmo esaminato ci fornisce alcuni dati sulle motivazioni delle formule imprecatricie che possono aiutare a meglio comprenderne il senso. Le riassumiamo brevemente per poi trarne delle indicazioni di lettura e di riflessione sui cosiddetti «Salmi impreicatori» in genere.

Il primo dato che emerge verte su Dio come vero destinatario dell'aggressione dei nemici. Il nostro Salmo, con tutta la sua violenza, scaturisce dalla consapevolezza che sono principalmente Dio e la sua Alleanza ad essere messi in questione dalle mire degli avversari ed è perciò l'interesse per la causa di Dio che provoca la reazione del salmista⁽⁵²⁾. D'altra parte, perché tale causa sia salvaguardata e la giustizia e la verità ristabilite, è necessario non solo che Israele venga salvato, ma anche che i nemici siano distrutti. Ciò che conta è che la verità di Dio appaia e si possa celebrare il suo nome; ma come è possibile questo, e come è possibile avere ancora fede, se coloro che distruggono il piano di Dio restano impuniti? Perciò, la richiesta del salmista non può essere che di punizione e sconfitta e il suo grido assume obbligatoriamente la sua connotazione «imprecatrice».

Ma tutto questo è, appunto, una richiesta. Chi deve agire è Dio perché fondamentalmente è Lui l'agredito e perché Egli solo è in grado di ristabilire la verità. Siamo in una situazione limite, in cui i giochi umani rivelano un'intenzionalità che li supera e in cui perciò tutte le risorse umane sono radicalmente impotenti a dare delle risposte adeguate. Da questa frontiera il salmista lancia il suo grido, e questo non può che diventare preghiera.

Notiamo qui che questi elementi emersi dallo studio del Sal 83 sono tipici e si ritrovano, almeno implicitamente, anche negli altri Salmi con connotazione «imprecatrice», inclusi i Salmi di lamento individuale in cui il salmista espone la propria situazione di ingiusti-

⁽⁵¹⁾ Il tema dell'imprecazione è stato oggetto di diversi studi. Tra questi segnaliamo: H. UBBELOHDE, *Fluchpsalmen und alttestamentliche Sittlichkeit*, (Breslau 1938); C. S. LEWIS, *Reflections on the Psalms* (London 1958) 20-33; T. WORDEN, *The Psalms are Christian Prayer* (New York 1961) 133-198; J. GOLDSTAIN, *Le monde des Psaumes* (Paris 1964) 118-139.

⁽⁵²⁾ Così, altrove, si invita esplicitamente Dio a prendersi a cuore la propria causa e difenderla: cfr. Sal 74,22-23.

zia subita e chiede la punizione dei propri persecutori (cfr., come esempio tipico, il Sal 109). Anche per tali Salmi si pone il problema della verità di Dio, risolvibile solo con la condanna degli avversari, ad opera di Dio stesso. L'esistenza dell'ingiustizia, infatti, mette in questione Dio in quanto Egli è il vero garante della giustizia nel mondo. Anche qui, se l'empio può accusare ingiustamente ed avere comportamenti iniqui, e in tutto questo restare impunito, come è possibile credere nella giustizia divina e celebrare il Dio giusto e fedele alla sua creazione? Perché questo avvenga e la verità sia ristabilita, è necessaria la punizione dell'empio e la sua distruzione visibile, che renda ragione della fedeltà di Dio e la dimostri. E ancora una volta, è a Dio che ci si rivolge per questo, perché è in Lui l'ultima possibilità di salvezza da una situazione che si presenta senza scampo, e perché a Lui spetta di manifestarsi per ciò che realmente è.

Se ora noi apriamo tutto questo al discorso biblico preso nella sua totalità di Antico e Nuovo Testamento e reinseriamo questi elementi emersi dai Salmi nel contesto globale di tutta la Scrittura, possiamo giungere a delle indicazioni di senso utili per la lettura e l'uso dei testi in questione.

Accenno qui solo molto brevemente a delle piste possibili di elaborazione teologica.

Con l'allargamento al contesto di tutta la Scrittura, anche la nozione di nemico e di ingiusto si allarga. Si tratta dell'empio che, implicitamente o esplicitamente, si oppone al piano di salvezza di Dio sia a livello del rapporto di Alleanza che a quello di creazione. In tal senso anche Israele può essere quel nemico contro cui esso prega, se viene meno alla propria fedeltà a Dio⁽⁵³⁾, e così pure ogni credente che esprima, attraverso quei Salmi, la propria preghiera. In altri termini, è anche dalle proprie dimensioni di ingiustizia ed empietà che l'orante si ritrova ad invocare la salvezza, chiedendone la distruzione da parte di Dio.

Inoltre il Salmo, come detto, fa questo in forma di preghiera. Ciò significa non solamente una confessione, da parte dell'uomo, della propria impotenza a salvarsi, ma anche, conseguentemente, un'accettazione incondizionata delle modalità di tale salvezza. Quando perciò il salmista (e l'orante) prega per la liberazione propria o

⁽⁵³⁾ Cfr. Os 1,9 e tutta la teologia soggiacente.

del popolo e per l'annientamento degli avversari, in realtà si espropria dei propri sentimenti di vendetta per lasciare che sia Dio a compierla. Le formulazioni della richiesta possono avere anche connotati precisi determinati dal tempo e dalla mentalità soggiacente, ma ultimamente è poi Dio a dover agire e questo lascia necessariamente spazio alla sua libertà. La connotazione tipica dei Salmi come testo di preghiera fa sì che colui che li prega sia in qualche modo liberato dai sentimenti che vi esprime, perché li affida a colui a cui si rivolge. Nel caso particolare dei «Salmi imprecatori», questo vuol dire che i sentimenti di violenza e distruzione che vi sono espressi vengono esposti all'azione di Dio e ai suoi criteri, e sono questi che ultimamente ne determineranno l'attuazione e le sue modalità⁽⁵⁴⁾.

Ora, il Dio della rivelazione biblica a cui ci si rivolge con i Salmi è il Dio «misericordioso e compassionevole, longanime e grande in amore e fedeltà»⁽⁵⁵⁾ che nel Nuovo Testamento trova la sua rivelazione definitiva. Ultimamente, dunque, il Dio a cui si chiede di compiere la vendetta sull'empio nemico è il Dio di salvezza che distrugge l'empietà inviando il Figlio e che annienta il Nemico con la morte e la risurrezione del suo Messia. Qui è la vera, definitiva «vendetta», l'unica reale vittoria su chi attenta alla nostra vita e alla nostra felicità⁽⁵⁶⁾.

Pregare i «Salmi imprecatori», allora, si risolve in una richiesta pressante, drammaticamente espressa, della manifestazione di tale vittoria nel compimento della salvezza operata dalla morte e risurrezione del Figlio. Pregare i «Salmi imprecatori» significa, in definitiva, chiedere che il Regno di Dio finalmente venga.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta 25
00187 — Roma

Bruna COSTACURTA

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Questo è sempre vero, anche quando l'imprecazione non è espressa in termini di preghiera rivolta direttamente a Dio (cfr. per es. Sal 137,8-9). Infatti, i Salmi sono l'unico libro della Bibbia ad essere stato tramandato al popolo esplicitamente come testo di preghiera, senza altra funzione letteraria, e perciò in essi tutto è preghiera rivolta a Dio, qualunque sia la forma che il testo assume.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Es 34,6; Sal 86,15; cfr. Gioele 2,13; Giona 4,2; Sal 103,8; Neem 9,17.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Cfr. la parte riguardante la «vendetta del sangue» nell'articolo di L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, «La Rédemption œuvre de solidarité», *NRT* 93 (1971) 449-472.

SUMMARY

In Ps 83 the aggression of the people against Israel coincides with their aggression against God. The covenant of the enemies, whose past contains a history of opposition to YHWH, purposes not only to eliminate Israel, but also, by this, to effect an improper and blasphemous substitution of the Covenant relation, and to deny God as God (cfr. vv. 5 and 13, which should be read in close connection with one another). Therefore the Psalm seeks the intervention of YHWH as the one most directly concerned and as the only one capable of providing an adequate response. The reestablishment of God's truth can be accomplished only in a recognizable victory over his enemies, according to the models of past history (the period of the Judges) and of continuous experience (the forces of nature). The final part of the article presents some suggestions for reflection concerning imprecations and their inclusion in prayer.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Wiederaufnahme as a Marker of Redaction in Jn 6,51-58

Scholars have long debated the question of the relation of Jn 6,51-58 to the remainder of the discourse on Bread⁽¹⁾. The discussion has centered on the major difference in thought between the two sections of the discourse. But these were never sufficient to provide a satisfactory answer to the question whether the latter verses were indeed part of the original discourse.

As the text now stands the major problem is the seeming shift from the earlier portion of the discourse (vv.31-50) where the reaction requested is simply belief, an acceptance of Jesus as the bread come down from heaven, to the latter part (vv.51-58) where there are repeated references to the sacramental consumption of the body and blood of Jesus. Also in the first part of the discourse, it is the Father who gives Jesus; in the second part it is Jesus who gives his own body. It has of course been argued that such a difference in themes need not be an indication of separate authors since the last verses are the most likely place for such themes to occur. Thus the theological evidence alone was not able to prove that the verses stem from separate hands⁽²⁾.

Another problem for the meaning of vv.51-58 is caused by the context which immediately follows. In 6,63, there is the statement that the "flesh" (σάρξ) is of no avail. Following so closely the statement of v.53 ("unless you eat the flesh (σάρξ) of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you do not have life in you") and v.55 ("my flesh (σάρξ) is true food. . ."), the statement of v.63 is almost inconceivable. It certainly is contrary to the sentiments expressed in the so-called eucharistic section of the discourse and suggests that the two statements did not come from the same author⁽³⁾.

(1) See especially G. RICHTER, "Zur Formgeschichte und literarischen Einheit von Joh 6:31-58", *ZNW* 60 (1969) 21-55. For bibliography see S. SCHULZ, *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium* (Göttingen 1957) 115-116 n. 11 and 116 n. 3. See also R. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John* (AB 29; Garden City 1966) 284-291; P. BORGES, *Bread From Heaven. An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (NTSup 10; Leiden 1965) 189-192; J. D. G. DUNN, "John VI — A Eucharistic Discourse?", *NTS* 17 (1971) 328-338.

(2) The most complete discussion of these problems is in RICHTER, "Formgeschichte", 25, 33, esp. 39-48. Not all differences listed by Richter are equally convincing and some depend on a particular literary theory of the gospel which somewhat relativizes their value.

(3) RICHTER, "Formgeschichte", 25.

There are in addition several literary peculiarities in the text. There is for example the strange amount of repetition within the section when compared to what precedes it. Firstly, there is the statement of Jesus: Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς. It is found in this or a very similar form in 6,34.41.48.51. The statement in v.34 is easily accounted for as the introduction of the theme. The occurrence in v.41 is necessary to explain the arguing of the Jews. But the occurrences within the other verses remain awkward. In addition there is the quite lengthy repetition of much of vv.49-51a in v.58 as well as the original statement in vv.31-32.

Secondly, there is the somewhat peculiar use of Ἰουδαῖοι in 6,52. The usage of Ἰουδαῖοι is of course complex within the Fourth Gospel. The term is to be distinguished from the other terms for authorities such as Φαρισαῖοι, ἀρχιερεῖς and ἄρχοντες⁽⁴⁾. In addition the "mental" use of Ἰουδαῖοι to refer to the inhabitants of Judea is to be distinguished from the "hostile" use, which refers only to religious authorities and in such a way as to present them as hostile to the claims of Jesus⁽⁵⁾. For example, Ἰουδαῖοι in 6,41 is an example of the hostile use of the term. However the occurrence in 6,52 is the only instance in the gospel where the hostile Jews are shown to be divided among themselves and arguing. Although such division is characteristic of the "Pharisees" (e.g. 7,45-52; 9,16) and among the "Jews" in the neutral sense of the word (e.g. 11,45), it occurs only here as a mark of the other, hostile, group.

Thirdly, as Richter points out, the Jews here are said to be fighting (ἐμάχοντο) among themselves⁽⁶⁾. This is the only instance of the verb in the gospel or in the body of Johannine literature although it is said that they "grumble" among themselves (ἐγόγγυζον) several times (6,41.43.61; 7,32).

Fourthly, the word for "eat" shifts from φαγεῖν, the commonly used word, to τρώγειν, which emphasizes the action of chewing, as if to draw attention to the actual process of eating something material.

Even the fine form-critical study of the discourse by P. Borgen leaves the question of the relation of vv.51-58 in doubt⁽⁷⁾. It will be remembered that Borgen suggested that the literary form of 6,30-58 was that of a homiletic exposition of scripture. Borgen found parallels to the form in the homiletic techniques of Philo and the Palestinian midrashim.

⁽⁴⁾ Such differences in portrayal of the authorities would suggest that the various terms do not stem from a single author. This was argued by J. WELLHAUSEN, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin 1908) 9, 38-39, 45-47; F. SPITTA, *Das Johannes-Evangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu* (Göttingen 1910) 21, 202-204; M. C. WHITE, *The Identity and Function of Jews and Related Terms in the Fourth Gospel* (Dissertation; Ann Arbor 1972) *passim*, esp. 327-334; U. C. VON WAHLDE, "The Terms for Religious Authorities in the Fourth Gospel: A Key to Literary Strata?", *JBL* 98 (1979) 231-253.

⁽⁵⁾ For a detailed treatment of this, see my "The Johannine 'Jews': A Critical Survey", *NTS* 28 (1982) 33-60.

⁽⁶⁾ RICHTER, "Formgeschichte", 40.

⁽⁷⁾ BORGES, *Bread From Heaven*. R. Brown seems to have been the first to point out that Borgen's thesis would fit also a homily which ended at v. 50 (*John*, 277-278; 287-290).

In that technique, the expositor begins with a quotation of scripture. The quote is then paraphrased to emphasize the point to be made in the exposition. The body of the homily then proceeds to develop and explain the various elements of the original, phrase by phrase. Frequently, in the course of the exposition another subordinate quotation is introduced to support the original exposition. Borgen also observes that it is typical in rabbinic exegesis for the commentator to introduce hypothetical objections to his exposition. The exposition then ends with a repetition of the scripture paraphrase as presented at the beginning of the exposition⁽⁸⁾.

When compared with the exposition in Jn 6,31-58, the homiletic techniques found in Philo and the Palestinian midrashim serve to shed much light on the structural development of the Johannine discourse. Borgen argued from his form-critical study that the discourse in Jn was a unity throughout, including vv.51-58. In this view, the final eight verses developed the final element of the original scripture paraphrase: "to eat"⁽⁹⁾. There are two problems with this however.

R. Brown and G. Richter have rightly pointed out that the discourse could end at v.50 and all of the elements of the homiletic pattern would still be accounted for, including the mention of eating in v.50⁽¹⁰⁾.

A more serious problem however is found in the repetition of the scripture paraphrase not only at the end of the homily (v.58) but in vv.49-50. Borgen suggested that the repetition serves to mark off (with the other instances) the beginning, middle, and end of the homily⁽¹¹⁾. He thus acknowledged that the verses functioned in the same way as the concluding quotation, but his explanation of it as a stylistic device was a conjecture since such repetition is not found in any of the parallel forms of the homily. In the parallels the scripture occurs at the beginning, where it of course presents the subject matter for the entire homily. It also occurs typically (though not universally) at the end where it, or a similar statement, serves to sum up and to integrate the conclusions of each of the previous parts of the homily. It is difficult to imagine what purpose it would serve in the middle of the homily. To say that it is a stylistic device is not convincing. Thus Borgen's explanation of vv.49-50 does violence to the very homiletic form that he is describing. As Richter put it: "Das homiletische Schema... erweist sich als Bumerang". However Richter's observation came at the problem from a different angle since he had observed that nowhere in the parallels is the same topic (in this case "to eat") developed within the same discourse in two ways with two separate endings⁽¹²⁾.

The present study, however, would suggest that new light can be shed on the passage by examining the text from the perspective of the redactional device known as the "repetitive resumptive".

In recent scholarship there has been considerable attention brought to the

⁽⁸⁾ BORGAN, *Bread From Heaven*, 28-42.

⁽⁹⁾ *Ibid.* 35; 189 n. 3.

⁽¹⁰⁾ BROWN, *John*, 294; RICHTER, "Formgeschichte", 24-25.

⁽¹¹⁾ BORGAN, *Bread From Heaven*, 87.

⁽¹²⁾ RICHTER, "Formgeschichte", 24-25.

use of repetition as a marker of editorial additions within the gospel of John⁽¹³⁾. The essential characteristic of the technique is that after an editor interrupted the sequence of a text in order to add material, he repeated a part of the original material in order to reestablish the original sequence of the passage. There are instances in the gospel of John in which the technique has taken the form of a very precise reformulation and resumption (e.g. 4,40; 4,45; 6,24)⁽¹⁴⁾. It has also taken the form of more loose and informal repetition and resumption (e.g. 2,5; 4,50)⁽¹⁵⁾. In narrative instances, the editor frequently began his resumption with either ὅτε οὖν or ὥς οὖν (e.g. 4,40; 4,45, etc.). In discourse material the typical method is to simply repeat the material from before the insertion (e.g. 18,6; 18,37)⁽¹⁶⁾. Sometimes the additions are marked by the resumptive phrases such as ταῦτα εἰπὼν (e.g. 9,6) or ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο (11,7). This method seems to be used when the addition bears little relation to the surrounding context and does not pretend to be an extension of but simply an intrusion into the context.

The discovery of this same literary technique in other books of the New Testament and throughout the Old Testament as well as in extra-biblical literature confirms beyond a doubt that such a technique was a common means in the ancient world for making editorial changes and additions within a text while at the same time recognizing and honoring the integrity of the traditional sequence⁽¹⁷⁾.

⁽¹³⁾ The most complete survey of this technique is found in the recent article by F. NEIRYNK, "L'Epanalepsis et la critique littéraire à propos de l'Évangile de Jean", *ETL* 56 (1980) 303-338. Neirynek discusses the variations in approach and covers all the significant literature, tracing it back as far as a quite similar technique noticed by M. FLACIUS in 1576 in his *De Stylo Sacrarum Litterarum*.

The technique has been given a number of names: "Wiederaufnahme" (KUHL, BOISMARD), "resumptive repetition" (WIENER), "repetitive resumptive" (VON WAHLDE), "reprise et répétition" (NEIRYNK), *Epanalepsis* (FLACIUS). E. HIRSCH was the first to apply it to the study of the Fourth Gospel. More recently, M.-E. BOISMARD discusses it in his "Un procédé rédactionnel dans le quatrième évangile: *La Wiederaufnahme*", in *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie* (BETL; ed. M. De Jonge; Leuven Gembloux [1978], 235-241) and U. C. VON WAHLDE in his "A Redactional Technique in the Fourth Gospel", *CBQ* 39 (1976) 520-533. BOISMARD has made it a major literary critical tool in his study of the gospel (M.-E. BOISMARD and A. LAMOUILLE, with the collaboration of G. ROCHAIS, *L'Évangile de Jean. Commentaire. Synopse des quatre évangiles en français*, III, [Paris 1977]) and in his introduction to literary analysis (M.-E. BOISMARD and A. LAMOUILLE, *La vie des évangiles Initiation à la critique des textes*, Paris 1980). Other Johannine scholars have also made reference to the phenomenon in the gospel but not in the detail of those mentioned above; for example R. FORTNA, *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel* (NTSMS 11; Cambridge 1970) and J. M. ROBINSON, in J. M. ROBINSON and H. KOESTER, *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia 1970).

⁽¹⁴⁾ These are examined in detail in VON WAHLDE, "Redactional Technique".

⁽¹⁵⁾ For a discussion of these see ROBINSON and KOESTER, *Trajectories*, 244-245.

⁽¹⁶⁾ BOISMARD, "Wiederaufnahme", 240.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Studies of the technique in the OT include: C. KUHL, "Die 'Wiederaufnahme' — ein literarkritisches Prinzip?", *ZAW* 64 (1952) 1-11; H. M. WIENER,

The criteria for determining the presence of the redactional marker are somewhat fluid, however four general criteria can be established. Firstly, there is the presence of awkward repetition. The more extensive and the more awkward the repetition is, the more likely it is that we are dealing with redactional repetition. It is also significant if the repetition cannot be shown to serve some other clear function within the text. Secondly, the presence of phrases which have no other function than to resume or which are awkward in the text. Such phrases would be the temporal marker ὅτε (ὥς) οὖν — especially when it does not have its temporal function⁽¹⁸⁾ — or the markers such as ἔπειτα μετὰ ταῦτα, etc. Thirdly, the intervening material contains “*aporiai*”, literary features which are either inconsistent with or contradictory to the surrounding context. These can be “literary” in the general sense, or stylistic or theological. Fourthly, the “primitive” sequence attained by the excision of the supposed addition must make reasonable sense. In some cases, in fact, the resulting original sequence makes much better sense than the text as we now have it. In a given text, these factors will be present in varying degrees and so the texts must be judged individually. However the presence of a majority of them would be a strong indication that the material has in fact been edited.

Application of these criteria to vv.51-58 of the discourse on the bread of life, suggest strongly that vv.51-58 are a redactional addition.

We would suggest that vv.49-50 comprise the original ending of the discourse and that v.58 comprises the second finale necessitated by the addition of vv.51-57. The material in between is then the “sacramental addition”. However if we observe the verses closely we find that there are in fact two cases of repetition-in-order-to-resume. The first instance is v.51ab which repeats the part of the original discourse prior to the concluding paraphrase of scripture. The first six words of v.51 repeat v.48 but then amplify that statement by combining with it the statement in v.50a that that bread is the bread “come down from heaven”. Finally v.51b resumes the thematic of v.50b (ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ) by restating it in a positive form (ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). Thus v.51ab functions as a resumptive of the previous sequence of the text recapitulating all the context of the prior material. V.51c then introduces the new material: the identification of the bread with the flesh of Jesus. This focus on the flesh of Jesus becomes the major thematic of the following verses. The extent of the resumptive just described may be diagrammed as follows:

The Composition of Judges 2:11 to 1 Kings 2:46 (Beigabe zur OLZ, 32; Leipzig 1929); I. L. SEELIGMANN, “Hebraische Erzählung und biblische Geschichtsschreibung”, *TZ* 18 (1962), 305-325; W. RICHTER, *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft. Entwurf einer alttestamentlichen Literaturtheorie und Methodologie* (Göttingen 1971). H. VAN DYKE PARUNAK also treats the technique briefly in the larger context of literary devices in his “Oral Typesetting: Some Uses of Biblical Structure”, *Bib* 62 (1981) 153-168.

⁽¹⁸⁾ VON WAHLDE, “Redactional Technique”, 525.

- v.48 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς
 v.50 (οὗτός ἐστιν) ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων
 v.51a ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς
 v.50b ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγη καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ
 v.51b ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

It was mentioned that there is a great verbal similarity between the resumption (v.51ab) and that of the original (v.48) except for the final part of v.51b. We would suggest that the change was made to the positive formulation in v.51b in order to expedite the following discussion of Jesus giving eternal life, just as the original formulation had been in the negative (καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ) to echo the theme of dying found in the original comparison.

The second instance of the repetition necessitated by the editor's addition is the re-introduction of the concluding paraphrase at the end of the addition, in v.58. Just as v.51ab had repeated vv.48-50 in order to resume the prior sequence, v.58 repeats vv.49-50 as a way of re-introducing the necessary homiletic conclusion. If we divide vv.49-50 into three sections: (1) v.49 (2) v.50a (3) v.50b, we find an exact parallel to these in v.58 except that the order of two of the elements is reversed, thus: (1) v.58b (2) v.58a (3) v.58c. This repetition may be diagrammed as follows:

- v.49 (1) οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τὸ μάννα καὶ ἀπέθανον.
 v.58b (2) οὐ καθὼς ἔφαγον οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἀπέθανον
 v.50 (2) οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων
 v.58a (1) οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς
 v.50b (3) ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ
 [v.51b ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα].
 v.58c (3) ὁ τρώγων τούτον τὸν ἄρτον ζήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

In the third part of the comparison above, we have listed two possible similarities. A verbal similarity exists between 58c and 51b. But the thematic is so great between 58c and 50b that it seems appropriate to speak of that as being resumed in 58c also although it is expressed antithetically.

Thus we have an extensive repetition, perhaps the most extensive in the gospel. Further the repetition neatly marks off the entire sacramental section of the discourse.

Richter had proposed that v.51a was the original ending of the discourse and that it repeated much of the opening statement⁽¹⁹⁾. However, Richter failed to see that in the ending suggested by Borgen (i.e. v.58) there is a repetition of more than the "I am" statement of Jesus. Borgen correctly points out that the true closing statement echoes much of the language of the original quote of scripture as well as of the paraphrase⁽²⁰⁾. Thus it is correct

⁽¹⁹⁾ RICHTER, "Formgeschichte", 24, gives a detailed comparison of the verses between the two sections of the discourse. However when compared with that of BORGEN, *Bread From Heaven*, 37, it will be seen that Borgen is correct.

⁽²⁰⁾ BORGEN, *Bread From Heaven*, 37.

to say that vv.49-50 are the closing statement of the original discourse and not v.51a. In addition, the proposal of Richter does not account for the repetition involved between v.51ab and v.48. Nor was he able to assign a real function to the second ending of the homily in v.58.

The thesis of a redactional repetition then provides a more satisfactory explanation of the repetition than does the thesis of simple awkwardness or of a stylistic trait that interrupts the homily form. Thus the first of the criteria for the redactional technique is met.

The second criterion was the presence of awkward temporal makers in the text. Here the addition occurs within discourse rather than narrative and no temporal marker is used.

The third criterion is the presence of *aporiai* in the intervening material. In the present text there are several, and all are accounted for by the redaction as we have isolated it. If vv.51-58 are the work of a redactor, then we have an explanation for the sudden introduction of the sacramental theme not found earlier. Secondly, we have an explanation for the contradiction between the view of Jesus's flesh in vv.51-58 and the statement about the flesh in v.63. The latter verse which is part of the original sequence referred to the original discourse in its "sapiential" form and was meant to show that the Spirit alone made the acceptance of Jesus as the bread from heaven possible. The contrast with "flesh" was meant to refer to the purely human, earthly assessment of Jesus by the Jews (and others) who did not possess the Spirit and so did not see the inner reality of Jesus. Thirdly, the peculiar attitudes associated with the hostile Jews are accounted for not as the inconsistent usage of the Evangelist but as a use unique to the redactor who had no desire to continue the consistent use of the earlier stratum.

The fourth criterion was that the reconstructed sequence needed to make reasonable sense. It is in the light of this criterion that we have some of the strongest evidence that the verses are the work of a redactor. It was pointed out earlier that the form-critical study by Borgen found no parallels in which the scripture paraphrase occurred in the middle of the homily. Nor was it apparent why one would want to have it appear there. However when the verses are viewed as the addition of a redactor not only do we have a reasonable sequence but in fact one that is much better. The resulting form of the homily not only avoids the theological and literary problems above, but enables us to see the homiletic technique in its original, unaltered form.

It is of course true that the last element of the scripture paraphrase ("to eat") gets much less attention in the primitive form of the homily, but that is understandable in a sapiential form of the homily since the main point is the recognition of Jesus as the true bread and that he is indeed the one come down from heaven, sent by the Father. On the other hand, it is also understandable that the sacramental addition focus on the last element of the scripture paraphrase since the sacramental reception is precisely what is at issue.

Thus when viewed in the light of the criteria proposed for identifying repetition and resumption as redactional marker, there is convincing evidence that 6,51-58 are indeed the addition of a redactor as has long been suggested.

When compared with other instances of the redactional technique in the gospel, the present instance appears more complex since it involves two repetitions. This is caused by the fact that the addition occurs here in discourse material and that the material has been appended to the previous material rather than inserted into it. Appending the addition made it necessary first to resume the material and then to complete it finally with the appropriate homiletic ending.

As we said before, rather than doing violence to the homiletic format originally proposed by Borgen, the explanation of the text that we have offered here seems rather to help clarify it and make it even more plausible by accounting for the occurrence of the scripture paraphrase in vv. 49.50. The editor then while not the author of the original homily does indicate by his own handling of the material that he was aware of the homiletic form and shows his ability to use it himself in making the sacramental addition, thus providing additional reflection on the meaning of Jesus as the bread of life within the context of his own eucharistic community.

Loyola University of Chicago
6525 North Sheridan Road
Chicago, Illinois 60626
U.S.A.

Urban C. VON WAHLDE

Non-Joining Sympathizers (Acts 5,13-14) *

(11) And great fear came upon the whole church, and upon all who heard of these things. (12) Now many signs and wonders were done among the people by the hands of the apostles. And they were all together in Solomon's Portico. (13) None of the rest dared join them, but the people held them in high honor. (14) And more than ever believers were added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women. (RSV)

There is an oft-noticed apparent contradiction between v. 13a (τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς), on the one hand, and v. 13b and especially 14 (ἀλλ' ἐμεγάλυνεν αὐτοὺς ὁ λαός, μᾶλλον δὲ προσετίθεντο πιστευόντες τῷ κυρίῳ πλήθη ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν), on the other, of the fifth chapter of Acts. If potential converts are afraid to join the Christians, how can new believers be more numerous than ever? And if the people held the Christians in high honor, why did they not dare to join them? This problem is not at all affected by the popular suggestion that vss. 12b-14 have been interpolated into this "summary"⁽¹⁾, and it is only postponed by the less common hypothesis that v. 14 alone has been interpolated⁽²⁾; it is not much easier to assume that an interpolator, rather than an author, created such a gross contradiction.

It appears that two major exegetical approaches, with variations, have been brought to bear upon this problem. The first depends on outwardly limiting the reference of "the rest" in v. 13a. Thus, one suggestion contrasts "the rest" with "the apostles" of v. 12a, explaining that vs. 13a means that converts to Christianity were afraid to associate with the apostles, out of fear of official measures against them (such as those which in fact followed shortly thereafter, according to vv. 17-18)⁽³⁾. However, v. 12b's "all" seems to indicate that it was in fact all the Christians, not only the apostles, who congregated in Solomon's Portico, and it is in any case difficult to believe that

(*) I would like to thank Fr. William J. Dalton, S. J., and Mr. David Satran for their comments on a draft of this paper, also the Maersdorf Fund for my appointment as Maersdorf Lecturer in Jewish History at Hebrew University, 1981-83.

(1) So, among others, P. BENOIT, *Exégèse et théologie* (Cogitatio fidei; Paris 1961) II, 181-192; H. ZIMMERMANN, "Die Sammelberichte der Apostelgeschichte", *BZ* 5 (1961) 78. Some editions, such as the *Jerusalem Bible*, go so far as to print v. 12a after v. 14.

(2) V. ROSE, "La critique nouvelle et les Actes des Apôtres", *RB* 7 (1898) 340-341; A. VON HARNACK, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Beiträge zur Einleitung in das NT, 3; Leipzig 1908) 167.

(3) G. FITZER, "τολμάω", *TWNT* VIII, 184.

the fear of official measures would scare away Christians but not intimidate new converts, such as those mentioned in vv. 13b-14⁽⁴⁾. Moreover, this suggestion entails weakening the sense of κολλᾶσθαι to spatial approach to, instead of entering into, the community; such a limitation is, as we shall see, unlikely⁽⁵⁾. Finally, this suggestion assumes that the fear which explains the failure to dare (v. 13a) was engendered by an unmentioned source (official-dom)⁽⁶⁾. However, responsible exegesis must, I believe, assume that it was rather the fear explicitly mentioned just two verses previously, namely, the fear engendered by the fate of Ananias and Sapphira (v. 5.11).

Two other varieties of this first exegetical approach would define "the rest" by contrasting them with "the people" of v. 13b: either the upper classes (as opposed to the lower-class "people") did not dare to join, due to their fear of official measures⁽⁷⁾, or other sectarians (as opposed to the undifferentiated "people"), hostile to the Christians, did not join them⁽⁸⁾. But the former suggestion is open to the final objection noted in the preceding paragraph (wrong reason for fear), and the latter suggestion does not explain the use of "dare": if hostile sectarians did not join the Christians, it was because they did not *want* to. Moreover, both of these suggestions assume that "the rest" of v. 13a are distinguished from others yet to be mentioned, "the people". However, the term "the rest" is a relative one, and it is more natural to take it as distinguishing a group from another *already* mentioned. This, indeed, is the case in Luke-Acts, where, in all of the ten other cases in which οἱ λοιποὶ is used, it appears *after* the referent with which it is contrasted⁽⁹⁾. In our case, therefore, the most natural interpretation is that "the rest" are to be distinguished from the Christians mentioned in v. 12; they are, in other words, all non-Christians⁽¹⁰⁾, and from their ranks came, ne-

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. W. M. FURNEAUX, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford 1912) 73.

⁽⁵⁾ And FITZER (*tolmaō* 184, n. 14) is forced to admit that the use of this verb does not correspond to the author's intention according to the situation.

⁽⁶⁾ This objection would, of course, be obviated by any of the imaginative suggestions which would emend "rest" into "Levites", "elders" or "rulers"; for references, see F. F. BRUCE, *The Book of the Acts* (New London Commentaries; London 1954) 117, n. 19; B. M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London-New York 1975) 329. Similarly, some scholars have suggested translating κολλᾶσθαι as "meddle with", "harass", but this meaning seems to be unparalleled (so BRUCE, *ibid.*, and K. LAKE and H. J. CADBURY, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, IV [London 1933] 53); this difficulty led A. PALLIS (*Notes on St Luke and the Acts* [London 1928] 54-55) to suggest emending κολλᾶσθαι into κωλύσαι!

⁽⁷⁾ So R. P. J. RENIÉ, *Actes des Apôtres* (La Sainte Bible 11/1; Paris 1949) 91, who builds on the paraphrase (people = "le vulgaire") by A. LOISY, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris 1920) 272. Similar: G. RICCIOTTI, *Gli Atti degli Apostoli* (Rome 1951) 115.

⁽⁸⁾ B. REICKE, *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde* (ATANT 32; Zurich 1957) 92-93.

⁽⁹⁾ Luke 8,10; 12,26; 18,9.11; 24,9.10; Acts 2,37; 17,9; 27,44; 28,9.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Various commentators (such as E. HAENCHEN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* [MeyerK; Göttingen 1968] 198, n. 5) point also to Luke 8,10 (contrast Mark 4,11) in support of this meaning. Referring additionally to Eph 2,3, Phil 1,13 (?) and 1 Thess 4,13 and 5,6, C. BURCHARD ("Fussnoten zum neutestamentlichen

cessarily, the praising "people" of v. 13b⁽¹¹⁾ and the new believers of v. 14.

The other major exegetical approach is to accept the paradox: our passage means that while some did not dare to approach the Christians, separated from them, as it were, by an invisible cordon of reverence, many others did dare to convert. Only "believers" (v. 14) were willing to take the step of joining the Christian community; others remained at a respectful distance⁽¹²⁾. According to this suggestion, again, κολλᾶσθαι does not refer to entering the community but rather only to spatial approach⁽¹³⁾.

This solution, despite its popularity, is not entirely satisfying. First, it is strange that, without any further comment or explanation, some are said to be afraid to take even a minor step (spatial approach) while many others are prepared fully to convert; what accounts for the difference? Second, if it is not to leave the contradiction unresolved, this approach too must assume that "the rest" of v. 13a are distinguished from those mentioned only thereafter. Third, and especially, we must object to the limitation of κολλᾶσθαι to spatial approach. Examination of Hatch and Redpath will show that in an overwhelming majority (24/28) of its appearances in the Septuagint where the Hebrew equivalent is known, that equivalent is a form of root *dbq*, which implies an intimate attachment, "cleave"⁽¹⁴⁾. Such is also the apparent connotation of the word in all but one of its other six appearances in Luke-Acts⁽¹⁵⁾. Moreover, that one exception, Acts 8,29, which is cited in support of the merely spatial meaning of the word in our passage⁽¹⁶⁾, seems rather to prove the rule. For there we read that the pedestrian Philip was instructed to κολλᾶσθαι the Ethiopian eunuch's carriage, and that he had to run to do so [v. 30]; the meaning of the word is plainly "overtake", "catch up", which in Hebrew and Aramaic would be represented by the *hiphil* form

Griechisch", *ZNW* 61 [1970] 159) even wonders if the words had a semi-technical meaning: "die Aussenstehenden".

⁽¹¹⁾ For Luke's use of ὁ λαός, as in this verse, to designate that part of the Jewish people which was favorably disposed toward Christianity, see A. GEORGE, "Israël dans l'œuvre de Luc", *RB* 75 (1968) 522.

⁽¹²⁾ So, especially, HAENCHEN, *Apostelgeschichte*, 201; BURCHARD, "Fussnoten" 159-160. Similar: BRUCE, *Book of the Acts*, 118; FURNEAUX, *The Acts*, 73; O. BAUERNFEIND, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (THKNT 5; Leipzig 1939) 88-89; T. BALLARINI, *Paolo: Vita, Apostolato, Scritti* (Torino 1968) 138; etc.

⁽¹³⁾ This meaning of κολλᾶσθαι is especially defended by BURCHARD, "Fussnoten", 159-160; see below, notes 15-16.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Actually one more case may be added, for κολληθήσῃ in LXX Deut 6,13, where it has no Hebrew equivalent, obviously reflects *tidbāq* of *ibid.* 10,20; in the LXX, the two verses are identical.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Luke 10,11; 15,15; Acts 9,26; 10,28; 17,34. All of these passages imply close association, despite BURCHARD'S attempt ("Fussnoten", 159-160) to limit the word's meaning, in the latter four cases (as well as Acts 5,13 and 8,29), to spatial approach. See the dictionaries and the next note.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Such as by HAENCHEN, *Apostelgeschichte*, 198, n. 6. As for Acts 10,28, 17,34 and especially 9,26, HAENCHEN agrees that the use of κολλᾶσθαι implies, in addition to spatial approach, also "das innerliche sich Anschliessen".

of *dbq*⁽¹⁷⁾. But if *κολλᾶσθαι* in vs. 13a thus carries a strong meaning, and "the rest" are all non-Christians, including those who will come to praise and believe (vv. 13b-14), then the way is open to another interpretation: while non-Christians did not dare to take a relatively extreme step, many did associate themselves with the Christian community in less intimate ways, such as the praising and believing of vv. 13b-14 (and vv. 15-16 as well). What was the more intimate association, alluded to by *κολλᾶσθαι*, which they avoided?

Now whatever the literary relationship of this summary pericope to those in Acts 2 and 4, it seems justifiable, as many have argued, to use them mutually to facilitate their interpretation⁽¹⁸⁾. In this connection, it is most interesting that while the first two summaries mention, and even center upon, the Christian *koinōnia*, including common ownership — or at least common use — of property (2,44-46; 4,32,34-35), this subject does not reappear in the summary in chapter 5. Is its absence only a matter of chance? Is it not more reasonable to suppose that, given the unfortunate fate of Ananias and Sapphira, the fear which their deaths engendered frightened other prospective converts who might otherwise have donated their property to the Christian community? The supposition that such a causal connection is intended becomes even stronger when one notes yet another link between this third summary and the preceding account: not only is the daring of v. 13 explained by the fear of vv. 5 and 11, but also the fact that v. 14 specifically notes the affiliation of men and women — a detail unparalleled in the first two summaries — seems to reflect the deaths of a man and a woman in the preceding narrative⁽¹⁹⁾.

At this point, reference to the Qumran community, where communal ownership of property is better documented⁽²⁰⁾, is instructive: it is clear, both from the Scrolls and Josephus, that it was the transfer of property to the

⁽¹⁷⁾ As in Gen 31,23, Judg 18,22 and 1 Sam 31,2, as well as several other passages where the meaning is rather closer to "chase" than to "overtake". (One notes, however, that *dbq* in *hiphil* is only once translated by *κολλᾶν* in the LXX, and there — Jer 13,11 — the meaning is "cause to cleave"). On the semitisms of Acts, see the works cited in n. 22, below.

⁽¹⁸⁾ See J. DUPONT, "L'union entre les premiers chrétiens dans les Actes des Apôtres", *NRT* 101 (1969) 898 (with references to further literature).

⁽¹⁹⁾ HAENCHEN (*Apostelgeschichte*, 199, n. 3) wonders if the specific mention of women converts implies that Luke has hitherto reported only conversions of men; the above suggestion seems to fit the context better. (Note also "the women" of Acts 1,14.) On the function of the Ananias and Sapphira story in the surrounding and following context, see also S. J. NOORDA, "Scene and Summary: A Proposal for Reading Acts 4,32-5,16", *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (ed. J. KREMER) (BETL 48; Paris-Gembloux-Louvain 1979) 479-483.

⁽²⁰⁾ For a review of the evidence, the problems and the literature, see D. I. MEALAND, "Community of Goods at Qumran", *TZ* 31 (1975) 129-139. For comparisons of the Qumran community of goods to that described in Acts, see H. BRAUN, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, II (Tübingen 1966) 155-157; J. A. FITZMYER, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London 1971) 284-288.

community which constituted entrance into full membership. Only at that point did the novice become a part of the *yahad*⁽²¹⁾. This being the case, it is most interesting that Acts 2,47, at the end of the first summary (which includes an account of the Christian *koinōnia*), refers to the adding of members to the Christian *yahad* (προσέτιθαι τοὺς σωζομένους... ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό); that ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό represents *yahad* has widely been recognized⁽²²⁾. In contrast, our third summary, which does not mention *koinōnia*, speaks only of the adding of *believers* (προσέτιθεντο πιστεύοντες). The repeated use of προστιθέναι underlines the similarity of the two passages, which however makes the absence of *koinōnia* and *yahad* all the more striking.

I would suggest, therefore, that the summary in chapter 5 means that although non-Christians were afraid, due to the fate of Ananias and Sapphira, to cleave to the community as full members, namely, by sharing their property (the procedure which had led to the deaths of A. and S.), many were nevertheless willing to honor the Christians, believe in the Lord, and (vv. 15-16) benefit by Christian healing miracles. Read this way, the verses — whatever their origin — follow in a logical sequence: although non-Christians were hesitant to take the most extreme step, many did associate themselves with the Christian community of Jerusalem, much as the well-known “fearers of Heaven” (or “fearers of the Lord” or “sympathizers”) associated with contemporary ancient Judaism⁽²³⁾.

One might, perhaps, go a bit further and speculate that Gen 2,24, where we read that a man should “cleave to his wife, and they will (thus) become one flesh”, lies, among other factors, behind the idea of the Christian and Qumran *yahad*. In this verse, we find both oneness and communality, as well as the word “cleave” (*dbq*; LXX: προσκολλᾶσθαι, but plain κολλᾶσθαι in the citations in Matt 19,5 and 1 Cor 6,16). One might even wonder if the second summary’s statement, just before its reference to the Christians’ common property, that they were all “of one heart and one soul” (4,32) is a spiritualized allusion to Genesis’ “one flesh”. If this were indeed a biblical background of the *yahad* idea, wider implications might follow. One could imagine, for example, that the idea that they were “married” to the commu-

⁽²¹⁾ See JOSEPHUS, *Jewish War*, 2.122; IQS 6.17-23; MEALAND, “Community of Goods”, 135-136. On the totality of integration into the community upon final acceptance, see H. LICHTENBERGER, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen 1980) 214-218.

⁽²²⁾ See M. WILCOX, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford 1965) 93-100; M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford 1967) 10, n. 4; DUPONT, “L’union” 907-908; D. F. PAYNE, “Semitisms in the Book of Acts”, *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday* (edd. W. W. GASQUE and R. P. MARTIN) (Grand Rapids, Michigan 1970) 142-143; J. COPPENS, “La *koinōnia* dans l’église primitive”, *ETL* 46 (1970) 20-21; F. L. HORTON, Jr., “Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke-Acts”, *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (ed. C. H. TALBERT) (Perspectives in Religious Studies: Special studies series, 5; Danville, Virginia-Edinburgh 1978) 19-20.

⁽²³⁾ For a survey of the sources (including many in Acts), the problems and the literature, see M. STERN, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, II (Jerusalem 1980) 103-106.

nity had some connection with the Essenes' celibacy⁽²⁴⁾. Similarly, one might want to restudy, on this basis, the development of the conception of the church as the body of Christ, for Paul uses Gen 2,24 with regard to the Christian's, or the church's, union with Christ (1 Cor 6,15-17; Eph 5,29-32)⁽²⁵⁾. In documents currently available, however, I do not see evidence sufficient to turn this suggestion, that Gen 2,24 played such a role in either or both of the communities, into anything more than a possibility.

Department of Jewish History
Hebrew University
Jerusalem
Israel

Daniel R. SCHWARTZ

⁽²⁴⁾ For a review of this topic, see J. COPPENS, "Le célibat essénien", *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. DELCOR) (BETL 46; Paris-Gembloux 1978) 295-303. Note that Philo (*Hypothetica*, apud Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* 8.11.14-17) specifically explains the Essenes' demand of celibacy on the basis of their fear that marriage would upset the sect's *koinōnia*; a similar explanation is given by JOSEPHUS in *Antiquities*, 18.21, which is probably dependent upon Philo. (In *Jewish War*, 2.121, on the other hand, JOSEPHUS rather explains the Essenes' celibacy as a result of their conviction that no woman can remain faithful to her husband. One suspects that this is an expression of Josephus' own biases and experience: of his three wives [apart from a possible first one — *ibid.* 5.419], one left him shortly after their marriage [*Vita* 415], he divorced the next one "being displeased at her behavior" [*ibid.* 426], and of the third, for whom he has only praise, he notes that "in character she surpassed many of her sex" [*ibid.* 427].) Note too that in a new and extremely fragmentary Qumran text, tentatively termed a "marriage ritual" (4Q502), the word *yahad* tantalizingly appears some ten times; see M. BAILLET, *Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford 1982) 81-105 (concordance *ibid.*, p. 323, s.v. *yahad* [add 4Q502 22: 3]). For another attempt to explain the Essenes' *yahad* in conjunction with their celibacy, on the basis of a "Sinai tradition" (see especially Deut 33,5 [*yahad*] and Exod 19,15), see A. STEINER, "Warum lebten die Essener asketisch?", *BZ* 15 (1971) 9-11.

⁽²⁵⁾ See A. M. DUBARLE, "L'origine dans l'Ancien Testament de la notion paulinienne de l'Église Corps du Christ", *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus* 1961 (AnBib 17-18; Rome 1963) I, 231-240.

Les deux versions du voyage de saint Paul de Corinthe à Troas (Ac 20,3-6)

Au cours de son troisième grand voyage, saint Paul reste trois ans à Éphèse. Il en fonde l'Église, enseigne et convertit Grecs et Juifs. Après sa victoire sur les exorcistes juifs il se propose de revenir à Jérusalem, mais par un chemin de missionnaire, en traversant la Macédoine et l'Achaïe, διελθὼν τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν (19,21). La révolte des orfèvres, artisans grecs (19,23-40), l'oblige à précipiter son départ.

Cet épisode est conté par Luc avec tant d'esprit, de vie et de détails que nous entendons les deux orateurs comme nous voyons les personnages. Mais à peine Paul a-t-il quitté Éphèse que les données des *Actes* deviennent vagues ou obscures. Le récit se précipite, lui aussi, dès les premiers versets du chapitre 20, et nous n'en discernons que les grandes lignes, sans rien apprendre sur le moment ni la durée des actes. Verset 1: adieux de l'apôtre aux disciples d'Éphèse. - Verset 2: traversée de la Macédoine et arrivée «en Grèce». - Verset 3: après trois mois, une machination des Juifs oblige Paul à faire demi-tour pour regagner Jérusalem; mais, comme à l'aller, il passera par la Macédoine. - Verset 4: ses sept compagnons de route. - Verset 5: ils attendent Paul en Asie, à Troas. - Verset 6: avec Luc, soudain reparu, Paul s'embarque à Philippes (c'est à dire à Neapolis, le port de la ville) et la réunion générale se fait à Troas.

L'histoire est tracée à traits lâches. Dès que l'on cherche à serrer les faits et à saisir leur enchaînement, on se perd en conjectures, et d'abord avec le texte court⁽¹⁾. Le texte long, l'«occidental», ne peut pas être plus obscur. Mais on ne peut s'en rendre compte que par une confrontation des pièces du procès, texte et traduction des versets 3 à 5, non sans avoir au préalable remarqué la fin du verset 2, commune aux deux textes; il y est dit qu'après la Macédoine, Paul «arriva en Grèce», ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα. «En Grèce»? il serait plus exact d'écrire «en Achaïe» puisque tel est le nom de la province romaine, gouvernée par un proconsul, détachée par Auguste de la Macédoine et comprenant Thessalie, Épire, Acarnanie, avec l'Attique et le Péloponnèse

(¹) On rappelle pour mémoire que le livre des *Actes* est venu à nous selon deux versions: la première, œuvre de Luc, dite, et mal dite, «orientale», communément adoptée, donne un texte plus court que la seconde, dite «occidentale», dont le représentant le plus sûr est le *codex Bezae* (sigle D). Celle-ci comporte des suppressions toujours brèves, et plusieurs centaines de modifications et adjonctions. Elle passe en général pour l'œuvre d'un glossateur. Mais, quel qu'en soit l'auteur, ses leçons méritent le respect, car elles peuvent remonter au second siècle. Un état du texte antérieur à celui des plus anciens papyrus et manuscrits nous est ainsi, au moins en partie, révélé.

de la Grèce ancienne. On aimerait savoir de quelle Grèce il s'agit. Est-ce une ville, une région, le pays grec entier? Paul est-il resté tout le temps au même endroit, s'est-il déplacé? Les *Actes* sont muets là-dessus et il faut la première Épître aux Corinthiens, 16,6, pour que Paul nous apprenne lui-même que cette «Grèce» des *Actes*, 20,2, se réduit à la ville de Corinthe.

Le texte court qui suit ne laisse pas moins à désirer. Donnons-en la traduction littérale, en y insérant les mots grecs méritant l'attention: «-3- Et au bout de (ποιήσας)⁽²⁾ trois mois, une machination ayant eu lieu (γενομένης) contre lui du fait des Juifs au moment où il allait prendre le large (μέλλοντι ἀνάγεσθαι)⁽³⁾ pour la Syrie, il s'avisa (ἐγένετο γνώμης) de faire son retour par la Macédoine. -4- L'accompagnaient Sopater, fils de Pyrrhus, de Bérée, Aristarque et Secundus, de Thessalonique, Gaïos, de Derbé (Δερβαῖος), Timothée, ainsi que Tychique et Trophime, Asiates (Ἀσιανοί). -5- Et ceux-ci (οὗτοι δὲ), s'étant approchés (προσελθόντες), nous (ἡμεῖς) attendaient à Troas». A partir du verset suivant, le récit devient clair et circonstancié.

Dans ce passage se posent d'abord deux problèmes de texte. On les verra résolus par la version occidentale. Au verset 5, le verbe προσέρχεσθαι, qui signifie toujours «s'approcher», et non «s'avancer», dans les *Actes*⁽⁴⁾, n'offre pas de sens admissible. On trouve dans le *codex Bezae* la correction qui s'impose: προσελθόντες. Au verset 4, l'adjectif Δερβαῖος fait croire que ce Gaïos est «de Derbé», et pose un problème, dont la solution est donnée par les éditeurs et les exégètes⁽⁵⁾ qui adoptent la leçon Δουβ[ε]ριος du *codex Bezae*: ce mot doit représenter Δοβήριος, c'est à dire un homme «de Dobëros», une ville de Macédoine. Gaïos n'est donc pas originaire d'une ville de la lointaine Lycaonie, mais ce même Macédonien qui vient d'être désigné au chapitre précédent, 19,29, comme compagnon de Paul à Éphèse.

Sur ces deux points des versets 4 et 5, le texte occidental est à préférer, et il l'est presque toujours par les exégètes qui ailleurs ne le jugent pas

(2) L'expression ποιεῖν χρόνον se rencontre encore ailleurs dans les *Actes*, en 15,33; 18,23. Le participe signifie simplement que le temps envisagé s'applique au personnage sujet.

(3) Le verbe ἀνάγειν appartient depuis Homère au vocabulaire marin. A l'actif, employé absolument, il signifie «partir (par mer)», avec un complément, «transporter (par mer)»; au moyen-passif, «lever l'ancre», «mettre à la voile», «gagner le large». En 28,10, le participe présent montre que le navire est encore au port: «au moment de notre départ (par mer)».

(4) Dans tous ses exemples des *Actes*, 7,31; 8,29; 9,1; 10,28; 12,13; 18,2; 22,26 et 27; 23,14; 28,9, il s'agit toujours de «s'approcher de» quelqu'un, d'une chose, ou d'un lieu, et le complément est toujours indiqué ou suggéré. Ici, on ne voit pas de qui, ou de quoi, «ceux-ci» se seraient approchés. Huit versets plus loin, 20,13, le préverbe est à corriger de la même façon.

(5) Notamment Lagrange, Streeter, Williams, Zuntz, Bruce etc. cités par METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek N.T.* (U.B.S. 1975) 475-476. Dans sa longue discussion, CLARK, *The Acts...* (Oxford 1933) 374-376, montre que Dobëros, ville située au pied du mont Pangée, est connue par Hérodote, 7,113 et par Thucydide, 2,98-100. La leçon fautive «de Derbé» s'explique par le rôle important que joue cette ville, évangélisée par Paul au cours de son premier voyage, 14,6 et 20 et suiv. L'apôtre y repasse lors de son second voyage, 16,1 mais non dans son troisième, l'actuel.

authentique. Il est fort possible que le responsable de l'erreur ne soit pas Luc, mais un premier copiste, suivi d'autres. Il reste que c'est le *codex Bezae* qui fournit déjà deux fois le bon texte et le bon sens.

Ce ne sont là que des fautes matérielles, peut-être fortuites, du texte court. Il y a plus grave. Le grec du passage n'a pas les qualités de pureté ni de netteté coutumières chez Luc. Le sens, par suite, n'est pas évident.

D'abord la succession de trois participes à des cas différents ne va pas sans gaucherie. Juxtaposés, ils sont mis, selon l'usage grec, sur des plans différents, et leurs valeurs circonstancielles ne sont pas les mêmes. Le nominatif ποιήσας, appliqué à Paul, exprime le temps, le génitif γενομένης, appliqué à la machination, exprime la cause, le datif μέλλοντι, appliqué de nouveau à Paul, exprime le temps, un temps apparemment déterminé par la cause. La proposition principale, avec Paul pour sujet, ne se présente qu'après ces trois participes subordonnés entre eux. Avant de l'atteindre, le lecteur, arrêté par les deux participes au génitif et au datif, pense un moment que Luc emploie, avec le participe initial ποιήσας, comme il le fait ailleurs, le tour du «nominativus pendens»⁽⁶⁾. Mais, quand il arrive à la principale, après les trois participes, il s'aperçoit alors, tardivement, que le sujet du premier est aussi le sujet de celle-ci, toujours Paul, «il s'avisa», ἐγένετο γνώμη.

De là une certaine gêne, accrue par les valeurs circonstancielles différentes, cause et temps, des deux participes intermédiaires. Comme, vu la juxtaposition des deux dernières participiales et l'accord du troisième participe, μέλλοντι, avec le pronom αὐτῷ, complément du second, γενομένης, il n'y a pas d'arrêt dans la phrase, on a l'impression que les Juifs se sont mis à comploter au moment où Paul était sur le point de prendre le large pour la Syrie. Mais est-ce qu'il était déjà embarqué sur un navire en partance⁽⁷⁾, ou la machination se place-t-elle dans les jours qui ont précédé l'embarquement? Ou encore a-t-il changé d'idée au moment du départ? Car, au lieu de partir directement pour la Syrie, il a décidé de retourner par la Macédoine. Mais quelle est la cause de ce revirement? Il semble que ce soit la machination des Juifs. Mais quelle est la cause de cette machination? Est-ce un renseignement qu'ils auraient reçu concernant le projet qu'avait Paul de quitter Corinthe? Autrement dit, à quel moment des trois mois de son séjour doit-on situer le complot? Le départ de Paul en est-il la cause ou l'effet?

Devant des questions si nombreuses on est réduit à des hypothèses. Ainsi Jacquier sur les embûches projetées par les Juifs: «On a pensé qu'ils voulaient se débarrasser de lui pendant son voyage par mer sur un bateau chargé de pèlerins allant à Jérusalem célébrer la Pâque, ou même le tuer à Cenchrées

⁽⁶⁾ Luc l'emploie par exemple dans son Evangile 12,10, et dans les *Actes* 7,40 (citation des Septante); 19,34. Le tour est possible en 8,7 si l'on n'adopte pas le πολλοῖς de D, probablement meilleur. En 10,37 Luc emploie un nominatif absolu, dans une expression très classique.

⁽⁷⁾ J. ROUGÉ, spécialiste de la navigation antique, dans une correspondance privée écrit: «Paul envisage vraisemblablement de s'embarquer sur un navire phénicien qui a hiverné à Cenchrées. Nous n'avons pas de témoins formels de pareille navigation, mais nous avons suffisamment de témoins de navigations proches de celle-là pour n'avoir aucun doute en la matière».

avant le départ du vaisseau; Paul et ses compagnons étaient porteurs d'une forte somme d'argent, fruit de la collecte pour les pauvres de Jérusalem. Les Juifs ont pu en avertir des pirates ou des voleurs pour faire attaquer l'apôtre soit en mer soit à terre. C'était en tout cas un complot qui ne pouvait réussir qu'à la condition que Paul prît la route de mer pour aller en Syrie; il le déjoua en suivant la route de terre, qui était plus sûre. Ce n'est pas certain. Ramsay conjecture que Paul, ne trouvant pas de bateau pour la Syrie à Cenchrées, prit la route de terre afin de ne pas rester dans ce port exposé aux embûches des Juifs»⁽⁸⁾.

Au lieu de nous laisser entraîner dans une suite romanesque, il est plus sage de revenir au texte grec, même si, par ses anomalies, il est responsable d'hypothèses quelquefois risquées, presque aussi nombreuses que les exégètes des *Actes*.

Et l'on n'a pas fini de faire le tour de ses défauts. Au même verset 3, on est encore gêné par l'expression ἐγένετο γνώμης, suivie de τοῦ avec l'infinitif, «il s'avisait de...», «il fut d'avis de...». C'est son seul emploi dans le Nouveau Testament, et elle étonne sous la plume d'un écrivain qui ne recule certes pas devant un hapax, mais ne l'emploie que si, existant dans le grec classique, le mot, ou le tour, possède ses lettres de noblesse. Or l'attique ne connaît que l'expression τῆς αὐτῆς γνώμης εἶναι, «être du même avis». Elle ne vaut que si l'on est, ou n'est pas, «de l'avis», quelquefois «du parti» de quelqu'un⁽⁹⁾, ce qui n'est pas du tout le cas ici.

Un dernier embarras, et de taille, se présente au verset 4. Jusque là l'action se passe à Corinthe, que Paul va quitter sans doute, mais qu'il n'a pas encore quittée. Il s'ensuit naturellement que les sept disciples ou amis qui l'accompagnent⁽¹⁰⁾ doivent partir avec lui de Corinthe. Mais on est surpris d'apprendre, au milieu d'un récit avare en précisions, de quelles villes ou pays ils sont originaires (sauf pour Timothée, dont Luc a dit précédemment, en 16,1, qu'il était de Lystres en Lycaonie). Sopater est de Bérée, en Macédoine, Aristarque et Secundus, natifs de Thessalonique, sont donc également Macédoniens; Gaïos l'est aussi, on l'a vu (note 5); Tychique et Trophime, comme Timothée, sont Asiates. Ainsi, des sept compagnons qui doivent faire route avec lui au départ de Corinthe, quatre sont nés en Macédoine, trois en Asie, et Luc ne dit rien des raisons pour lesquelles, provenant de directions si opposées, et venus de si loin, il les trouve réunis en Achaïe, à Corinthe, au moment précis où Paul y fait un séjour de trois mois. Une telle présence n'est pas en principe impossible; on s'étonne que Luc la considère normale.

Il faut encore, comme on l'a fait plus haut pour déterminer la ville désignée sous le mot de «Grèce», recourir aux Épîtres pour essayer de com-

⁽⁸⁾ E. JACQUIER, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (EBib; Paris 1926) 595-596.

⁽⁹⁾ Par exemple, sans parler des cas où εἶναι ne se trouve pas, Thucydide, 1,113,2; 5,46,4; 8,74,3; Xénophon, *Helléniques* 2,4,36 etc.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Il va de soi que le singulier συνέπειτο, accordé avec le premier sujet, vaut pour les six autres personnages, ce qui est possible, mais non obligatoire, quand le verbe est en tête. On peut préférer le pluriel συνέπειοντο du ms. D pour ne pas dissocier le groupe.

prendre le motif, ici passé sous silence, du rassemblement de l'apôtre avec ses compagnons. Il est probable qu'une des raisons qui, à Corinthe, poussait Paul à s'embarquer pour la Syrie, étape en direction de Jérusalem, était d'y porter le produit de la collecte organisée pour ses pauvres⁽¹¹⁾. Mais, contrairement à notre attente, rien n'est dit des sommes importantes recueillies dans une ville d'Achaïe riche comme Corinthe. Un tel silence étonne ici parce que, si Luc a bien indiqué plus haut, dans les *Actes*, 11,27-30, la raison initiale de la collecte, à savoir la famine prédite par Agabos, s'il fait allusion, plus loin, 24,17, à la raison pour laquelle Félix prolonge la captivité de Paul à Césarée, à savoir son espoir de toucher sa part des fonds qu'il suppose détenus par son prisonnier, ici, en Achaïe, pas plus qu'en Macédoine, il ne dit pas un mot de la collecte.

S'il faut comprendre, comme le texte court et ses silences nous y invitent, que Paul a convoqué ses sept compagnons en vue du transfert en commun des fonds de la collecte jusqu'à Jérusalem, pourquoi le rendez-vous est-il fixé à Corinthe? Se peut-il que ceux-ci l'accompagnent au départ de Corinthe (συνείπτο), mais qu'ils partent les premiers (προελθόντες) alors qu'il a dû lui-même quitter Corinthe précipitamment; se peut-il qu'ils l'attendent (ἔμενον) à Troas, et de surcroît qu'ils attendent l'apôtre accompagné de Luc (ἡμῶς), dont on ne sait ce qu'il est devenu depuis que Paul, lors de son second grand voyage, a évangélisé Philippes, où il semble l'avoir laissé⁽¹²⁾?

Il arrive à Luc de résumer les faits à l'excès, mais il ne nous a pas habitués à tant d'obscurités mêlées à tant d'invraisemblance. Son texte court est ici difficile à tolérer. Est-ce à dire que la version écrite par celui que l'on appelle communément un glossateur, dont on admet à la rigueur quelques mots isolés comme authentiques, risque de donner une meilleure idée de la réalité des faits?

* * *

Tournons-nous donc vers le texte long, et donnons-en d'abord la traduction. Elle fera apparaître des changements en même temps que des éléments nouveaux (soulignés par des caractères italiques):

«-3- *Mais*, au bout de trois mois, une machination ayant eu lieu⁽¹³⁾ contre lui du fait des Juifs, il *voulut* prendre le large pour la Syrie. *Mais l'Esprit lui dit* de faire son retour par la Macédoine. -4- *Alors, comme il allait partir...* (lacune évidente) ... *jusqu'en Asie*, Sopater, fils de Pyrrhus, de Bérée,

⁽¹¹⁾ Sur ces collectes, voir Rom 15,25; 1 Co 16,1,4; 2 Co 8,16-23 où Tite, responsable des fonds recueillis en Thessalie, est nommé, mais non ses deux compagnons. Pour se décharger de la responsabilité du transport de grosses sommes, Paul avait fait nommer à cet effet des «commissaires»; cf. J. DAUVILLIER, *Les temps apostoliques* (Sirey 1970) 626.

⁽¹²⁾ En 16,17 s'achève le second «passage-nous».

⁽¹³⁾ Voir la note 3. Ici le verbe est à l'infinitif aoriste passif, mais le sens ne change pas; pas davantage par le remplacement, quelques mots plus haut, du moyen γενόμενης par l'incertain γενηθείσ[ης], peut-être simple faute de copiste.

Aristarque et Secundus, de Thessalonique, Gaïos, de Dobèros, Timothée, ainsi que Tychique⁽¹⁴⁾ et Trophime, *Ephésiens*. -5- (Mais)⁽¹⁵⁾ ceux-ci, partis en avant, l'attendaient à Troas.»

Avant d'en venir à l'évidente lacune, puis à la transformation et addition remarquable qui la précède, il est bon de régler le cas des trois changements de second ordre, menus peut-être, mais non indifférents.

Au verset 3, la liaison initiale avec ce qui précède n'est plus un simple τε, «et», mais un δέ adversatif, annonçant que Paul va être obligé de modifier ses plans: «*Mais*, un bout de trois mois...»⁽¹⁶⁾.

Au verset 4, le *codex Bezae*, en remplaçant Ἀσιανοί, «Asiates», par Ἐφεσίοι, «Ephésiens», précise quelle est la ville, de la vaste Asie, dont Tychique et Trophime sont originaires; et l'on sait le rôle qu'Éphèse vient de jouer dans les *Actes*⁽¹⁷⁾.

Au verset 5, enfin, après l'inutile suppression, déjà signalée, de la conjonction δέ, qui crée une asyndète inattendue, le *codex Bezae* remplace ἡμᾶς par αὐτόν, «ceux-là nous attendaient», par «ceux-là l'attendaient». Il s'ensuit que le «passage-nous» en question ne commence pas au verset 5, mais avec le ἡμεῖς, «nous», du verset suivant. L'accent est maintenant mis sur le fait que le personnage attendu par les sept compagnons est avant tout Paul, le seul qui compte; il n'est pas question de Paul avec Luc. S'il était démontré que Luc est l'auteur du texte long, on trouverait là un signe nouveau de son habitude modeste.

Venons à la lacune. On vient de la qualifier d'«évidente». En effet le verset 4 ne peut se passer d'une proposition principale; et son verbe doit se placer nécessairement entre «comme il allait partir» d'une part, et de l'autre «jusqu'en Asie»: il est impossible que «jusqu'en Asie» se rattache à «comme il allait partir».

Nous sommes en présence d'une nouvelle faute d'un copiste, une faute ici grave parce qu'il a sauté un ou plusieurs mots dont un verbe⁽¹⁸⁾. Mais

⁽¹⁴⁾ Le ms. D écrit Εὐτυχος, faute évidente de copiste, pour Τύχικος, par l'influence de 20,9.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Il faut rétablir, dans le texte long, après οὗτοι, le δέ du texte court. On verra note 18 pour quelle raison il a dû être supprimé à l'initiative d'un copiste.

⁽¹⁶⁾ La 26^e édition (1979) du *Novum Testamentum graece*, de Nestle-Aland, dont le texte fait autorité, a le tort de ne pas arrêter la phrase du v.2 avec la fin du verset, mais de la prolonger jusqu'à μῆνας τρεῖς inclusivement. Une telle ponctuation est à rejeter, pour deux raisons: 1^o) La nouvelle phrase commençant par γενομένης (ou γενηθείσης), contrairement aux usages du grec, ne serait pas liée à la précédente; une asyndète n'aurait pas sa raison d'être. 2^o) Le sens ainsi donné est impossible: «Il arriva en Grèce et au bout de trois mois.» Ici s'arrête la phrase, achevée par la proposition participiale ποιήσας. Certains traducteurs semblent s'autoriser de cette ponctuation pour rattacher la proposition initiale du v.3 à la fin du v.2 et traduisent: «Il arriva en Grèce, où il passa trois mois.» Une telle traduction, qui fait bon marché à la fois de τε et du participe ποιήσας, n'est pas soutenable en soi; en outre elle fausse le mouvement du texte.

⁽¹⁷⁾ En 21,19 Luc rappelle que Trophime est Éphésien.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cette faute est classique: c'est le «saut du même au même», de ΑΥΤΟΥ à ΑΥΤΩ presque identique. Et c'est sans doute pour la corriger, d'ailleurs sans

nous avons la chance de découvrir les mots qui manquent — ils sont deux — dans une annotation marginale de la «Syra harklensis»: après «comme il allait partir» on y lit: «l'accompagnaient», ce qui est déjà confirmé par le texte court. On lira donc, sans hésiter, avec Clark, μέλλοντος οὖν ἐξιέναι αὐτοῦ, (συνεῖποντο αὐτῷ) μέχρι τῆς Ἀσίας...

S'il est clair qu'il importe de combler par ces deux mots-là la lacune du texte long, il reste à les comprendre. Il est également clair que l'imparfait συνεῖποντο ne peut avoir son sens habituel et signifier la durée dans le passé puisque Paul n'est pas parti mais qu'il «va partir», μέλλοντος ἐξιέναι. Accompagne-t-on quelqu'un dans son voyage quand ce voyage n'a pas commencé? Il est aisé de répondre à l'embarrassante question en donnant à l'imparfait une valeur peut-être moins fréquente, mais nullement exceptionnelle dans le meilleur grec, celle de l'effort dans le passé, lorsqu'il s'agit d'une action prévue, voulue, ou attendue dans ce passé⁽¹⁹⁾. Et ce sens va être immédiatement confirmé, au début du verset 5, par le participe προελθόντες: si les sept compagnons devaient accompagner Paul, et s'ils l'ont attendu à Troas, c'est que, prenant les devants et partis les premiers, ils ne l'ont pas accompagné.

Mais déjà l'on peut traduire le début du verset 4, sans avoir encore expliqué ses additions: «*Alors, comme il allait partir*, (devaient l'accompagner) *jusqu'en Asie* Sopater etc. . . ».

La lacune ainsi comblée, il faut maintenant diriger son attention sur les mots ajoutés de part et d'autre. L'addition de «jusqu'en Asie» ne pose aucun problème puisque cette destination est tout de suite confirmée par l'attente de Paul à Troas; et cette seconde addition est inséparable de la première en éclairant d'une lumière nouvelle le point de départ du voyage. Il ne s'agit plus de partir, ἐξιέναι⁽²⁰⁾, de Corinthe, comme on le croyait jusqu'ici, *mais de Macédoine*. Sans doute rien n'est dit sur le trajet de Corinthe en Macédoine, mais rien n'était dit non plus sur le départ de Corinthe pour la Macédoine. Pourquoi, dans ces conditions, voudrait-on que le *codex Bezae* fût plus explicite en précisant que le départ ici mentionné est le départ de Macédoine, alors que la chose ressort implicitement de son texte? La Macédoine vient

adresse, que le copiste aurait supprimé le δέ du texte court, après οὔτοι, au v. 5, et donné ainsi à la phrase l'imparfait ἔμενον, «ils attendaient», comme verbe principal. Les apparences seraient sauvées, mais le sens ne l'est pas. Il convient de lire au début du v.5, on l'a vu, οὔτοι (δὲ)...

⁽¹⁹⁾ Par exemple: περιεγίνοντο, THUCYDIDE, 7,56,3; ἦγες, PLATON, *Phèdre* 230 a; ἐποιοῦντο, XÉNOPHON, *Helléniques* 2,2,20; ἐγίγνετο, DÉMOSTHÈNE, *Contre Boetos* I,6 etc. Le NT ne l'ignore pas; ainsi Mc 14,1; Lc 23,54. L'action attendue se rend aussi par μέλλω suivi de l'infinitif. Mais le ms. D ne pouvait s'en servir ici parce que le verbe (μέλλοντος) vient d'être employé par lui-même au v.4, une fois supprimé le μέλλοντι du texte court au v.3; en outre μέλλων ἐξιέναι va se retrouver dans les deux textes du v.7, et le verbe va servir encore aux versets 13 et 38 du chapitre 20 (cf. aussi son emploi en 1,5 D). Remarquable est la quantité, dans ce passage, de choses qui «allaient se passer».

⁽²⁰⁾ Le verbe ἐξιέναι appartient au vocabulaire lucanien, et ne se trouve que dans les *Actes*, 13,42; 17,15; 27,43; le quatrième exemple est trois versets plus loin, en 20,7, où μέλλων ἐξιέναι s'applique à un nouveau départ, celui de Troas. Il semble que l'auteur du *codex Bezae* s'en soit inspiré pour le départ de l'étape précédente, μέλλοντος ἐξιέναι, de Macédoine.

d'être nommée à la fin du verset 3, et tout le récit est écrit avec la concision d'un résumé; avec lui l'on saute d'un point à un autre sans exposé sur les intervalles. Avec le verset 6, le doute sera dissipé sans délai, puisqu'il va montrer Paul s'embarquant avec Luc à Philippes, en Macédoine, c'est-à-dire évidemment au port de Philippes, Neapolis.

C'est donc en Macédoine, apparemment, que se sont trouvés réunis avec Paul ses sept compagnons de voyage, et ce point de rencontre avant un nouveau départ ne saurait surprendre puisque l'un est de Bérée, deux autres de Thessalonique et un quatrième de Dobéros en Macédoine.

Avec le texte court, bref à l'excès, on avait l'impression que les compagnons étaient partis de Corinthe, après s'y être trouvés rassemblés sans que l'on sût ni quand ni pourquoi ni comment. Le texte long répond à notre perplexité: constatant que le texte premier risquait d'égarer le lecteur et de le mettre sur une fausse piste, l'auteur du second fournit, par les additions du verset 4, le maillon qui manquait à la chaîne.

Il n'explique pas tout, sans doute, il ne dit pas pour quelle raison les compagnons avaient pris les devants pour attendre Paul à Troas. Il ne dit rien de l'itinéraire suivi par Paul, avec Luc, pour gagner Troas et n'explique pas la longueur surprenante de la traversée de Macédoine en Asie⁽²¹⁾. Il se borne à indiquer les principales étapes, jusqu'au moment où la présence de Luc rend au récit l'abondance de ses détails et la précision de ses dates relatives.

* * *

En attendant ce retour à l'exposé circonstancié, texte court et texte long présentent l'un et l'autre des faits pour ainsi dire télescopés. Quelle en est la raison? Est-ce que le lecteur des *Actes* connaissait déjà un peu de l'histoire par les Épîtres? Il est plus probable que si Luc ramasse en quelques versets sommaires le voyage de Paul de Macédoine en Macédoine via Corinthe, c'est parce qu'un tel résumé correspond à son éloignement passager du maître. Il est insuffisamment renseigné sur les événements placés entre Éphèse et le départ de Macédoine pour Troas, sur la route plus que sinueuse qui doit conduire Paul jusqu'à Jérusalem en passant par la Macédoine, Corinthe, et encore la Macédoine, dans un endroit du livre situé entre des faits rapportés avec une foison de détails pittoresques, ceux de la révolte des orfèvres d'une part, et de l'autre, à partir du verset 6, un voyage et des étapes connus au jour le jour, quelquefois heure par heure, où il a reparu en personne aux côtés de l'apôtre en témoin de ses actes. Il ne mentionne ici, dans l'intervalle, qu'une seule date, fort vague, les «trois mois» du séjour de Paul «en Grèce»,

(21) J. ROUGÉ, dans une correspondance privée, s'étonne à juste titre de la longueur exceptionnelle de la traversée de Neapolis à Troas. Cinq jours de navigation pour couvrir en gros cent milles marins représentent une vitesse inférieure à un nœud. La solution du problème est probablement donnée par une escale à Thasos: cf. DUNAND-POUILLOUX, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, 193; P. LEMERLE, *Philippes et la Macédoine orientale*, 1-68.

trois mois serrés en trois versets où il garde le silence sur les activités du voyageur en mission. Après ces trois mois-là du séjour à Corinthe, une machination des Juifs, dont le moment exact reste inconnu, décide Paul à regagner Jérusalem. Sa volonté de partir est d'abord arrêtée. L'itinéraire ne sera choisi qu'après.

Ici apparaîtrait, croit-on souvent, un désaccord entre les deux textes. Selon la version courte, on voit que Paul préfère, de son propre mouvement, passer par la Macédoine, où il est sûr de retrouver de ses disciples et son médecin. Selon le *codex Bezae*, ce grand détour lui fut inspiré par l'Esprit. En fait il n'y a là aucune contradiction entre les deux textes, parce qu'une inspiration personnelle, chez Paul, quand elle concerne sa vie apostolique et missionnaire, ne peut provenir que de l'Esprit. Le texte long ne dit pas autre chose que le court, il ne fait que souligner, comme il lui arrive quelquefois, le rôle du Πνεῦμα⁽²²⁾.

Il n'y a pas de contradiction entre les deux versions également succinctes. Ce qui les sépare est la plus grande clarté de la seconde, écrite avec plus de légèreté, moyennant la coupure d'une phrase, quelques mots modifiés, quelques mots ajoutés; une telle économie des moyens, avec l'habileté de leur emploi, est une des caractéristiques du *codex Bezae*. Trop souvent victime de préjugés hostiles, il mérite de se voir réhabilité.

Dans les quelques versets ici examinés, il lie plus sûrement des événements décousus de la vie de l'apôtre, et surtout il nous épargne une erreur à laquelle on est exposé par l'excessive brièveté du texte court, sur un départ envisagé non de Corinthe, mais de Macédoine.

On aimerait savoir à qui attribuer le texte second. Est-ce Luc en personne qui corrige Luc? Rien n'interdit de poser la question.

«La Giride»

84210 La Roque sur Pernes
France

Édouard DELEBECQUE

⁽²²⁾ Comme en 19,1 D; cf. 19,21 et 20,22 du texte court, où le Πνεῦμα joue un rôle primordial. Le texte long lui accorde plus de place encore; cf. 11,17; 15,7.29.32; 26,1; outre les deux exemples de 19,1 et 20,3. - Voir aussi G. ZUNTZ, *Classica et Mediaevalia*, III (1940) 44 et n. 1.

Une notice byzantine de l'apôtre saint Jacques, frère de saint Jean

La notice qu'on va lire est datée avec assez de précision: elle est tirée du ménologe impérial offert à l'empereur Michel IV le Paphlagonien (1034-1041)⁽¹⁾, comme le prouve l'acrostiche du § 5.

Elle semble n'avoir utilisé d'autre source que les Actes de Jacques, qui ont été publiés en 1902 par Ebersolt et qui pourraient remonter à la fin du VIII^e siècle⁽²⁾. A ces Actes elle doit, par exemple, ses citations d'Hippolyte de Thèbes et de Josippos ou Joseph le Chrétien. Elle ne mentionne pas plus qu'eux trois épisodes de l'évangile (la résurrection de la fille de Jaïre, la transfiguration et l'agonie) auxquels fut mêlé saint Jacques. Elle ne fait même pas allusion à Jean Baptiste, dont Jacques aurait été le disciple. On notera aussi qu'il n'y est pas question de l'Espagne.

Elle nous est parvenue dans un seul manuscrit: le n° 736 de Patmos, copié au XIV^e siècle⁽³⁾. Elle y figure au 30 avril.

Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον Ἰάκωβον
τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου τοῦ θεολόγου
e codice Patmensi 736, fol. 170^v-173.

1. Jacques disciple du Seigneur. Intervention de sa mère. Surnom de Boanergès.

Ἄρτι τοῦ ἐμοῦ θεοῦ καὶ δεσπότης τὰς διατριβὰς ἐν τῇ γῇ ποιουμένου διὰ σαρκός, ἦν ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας παρθένου δι' ἐμὲ τὸν δοῦλον προσεῖληφε, καὶ μαθητὰς ποιουμένου μάρτυρας τῆς οἰκονομίας καὶ κήρυκας, πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἀνδρέας καὶ Πέτρος προσέρχονται καὶ ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ προθυμοῦνται, τῶν μεγάλων αὐτοῦ τεραστίων γεγονότες κατήκοοι· εἶτα τὴν Γενη [171] σαρὲτ καταλαβόντος καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείαν εὐαγγελιζομένου καὶ θεραπεύοντος πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου γόνιοι προσκληθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ οὗτοι προσέρχονται, τὸν πατέρα καταλιπόντες ἐκεῖ⁽⁴⁾. Ποιούμενου δὲ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείας, ὡς εἴρηται, ἡ μήτηρ αὐτῶν περὶ προσκαίρου δόξης οἰηθεῖσα

⁽¹⁾ Cf. *Anal. Boll.* 57 (1939) 225-232; A. EHRHARD, *Ueberlieferung...*, t. 3 (T.U. 52, 1943), p. 341-442.

⁽²⁾ Voir *BHG* 767. C'est la date proposée par l'éditeur, Ebersolt, p. 43.

⁽³⁾ Cf. EHRHARD, t.c., p. 378-383.

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. Mt 4,18-23.

διαλέγεσθαι τοῦτον· <Διδάσκαλε, λέγει, θέλω τῶν υἱῶν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου τὸν ἕνα ἐκ δεξιῶν, ἐξ εὐνούμων δὲ θάτερον καθεσθῆναι>, τοῦ δὲ μὴ εἶναι τοῦτο ἐμὸν εἰπόντος δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται⁽⁵⁾, τούτέστι τῶν σπουδαζόντων, καὶ τῆς μητρὸς μηδὲν ἕτερον προσθεμένης, ὁ τῆς διδασκαλίας λόγος προέκοπτε. Τότε τοίνυν [col. 2] ὁ δεσπότης βοανεργὲς ἐκάλεσε τούτους⁽⁶⁾ δι' ἣν εἶχε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀγάπην τε καὶ στοργὴν τῆς ἐνούσης αὐτοῖς χάριν ἀρετῆς. Τὸ δὲ βοανεργὲς υἱοὺς σημαίνει βροντῆς, τὸ μεγαλοφωνότατον αὐτῶν ὥσανει τῆς διδασκαλίας καὶ τοῦ κηρύγματος ὁ προγνώστης εἰδῶς⁽⁷⁾ καὶ διὰ ταῦτα τὴν ἐπὶ κλήσιν αὐτὴν τούτοις προσαρμοσάμενος.

2. *Sa propriété à Sion. Prédication en Judée.*

Τοῦ πατρὸς οὖν τῆς καλῆς ταύτης дуάδος, τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου φημί, τὸν βίον ἀπολιπόντος, ἡ μήτηρ τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ κυρίου συνῆν καὶ συνείπετο. Πολλὴν δὲ καὶ μεγάλην οὖσαν τὴν ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ κτήσιν αὐτῶν, χρημάτων ἀποδόντες, τὴν Σιών ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ διὰ τούτων ἐκτήσαντο, ὥς πού φησιν Ἰππόλυτος ὁ Θηβαῖος⁽⁸⁾. Κτήσις δὲ ἦν ἡ Σιών περιφανὴς καὶ μεγάλη· ἥς τὰ ἡμίση [171'] τῶν οἰκημάτων τῷ Καιάφᾳ πρὸς χρήσιν παρέσχον, κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον ἱερατεύσαντι καὶ μὴ ἔχοντι ὅπου δὴ ποιήσαιτο τὴν καταγωγὴν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ οὗτος ὥρμητο, τῆς Κίου δὲ κώμης τῆς Βιθύνων ἐπαρχίας⁽⁹⁾. Ὅθεν δὴ καὶ γνωστὸς ἦν Ἰωάννης τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου φωνήν⁽¹⁰⁾. Τάλλα δὲ κατεῖχον παρ' ἑαυτοῖς· ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸ πάσχα Χριστὸς σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐποιήσατο⁽¹¹⁾. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτως.

Τῆς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου πληρωθείσης οἰκονομίας καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ φαιδρᾶς ἀναλήψεως γεγονυίας καὶ τῆς τοῦ παναγάρχου πνεύματος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις γεγεννημένης ἐπιδημίας, τῶν μαθητῶν λοιπὸν τὸ κήρυγμα διαμερισμένων, τὴν λαχοῦσαν ἕκαστος καταλαβεῖν ἡπείγετο. Ἐνθεν τοι καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ [col. 2] σοφὸς εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐξιὼν — αὐταὶ γὰρ αὐτῷ κλῆρος ἔλαχον⁽¹²⁾ — κηρύσσων ἦν τὸν λόγον καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος, ἰώμενός τε τὰ πάθη τῶν ἀσθενούντων καὶ μέγала διαπραττόμενος θαύματα καὶ πολλοὺς ἐπιστρέφων πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν. Ἀλλὰ δὴ κὰν ταῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγαῖς εἰσιὼν ἐρμήνευε τε τὰ ἀναγνωσκόμενα τῶν τε προφητῶν καὶ τοῦ νόμου καλῶς καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπειθεν ὥς αὐτὸς ὁ κηρυττόμενος Χριστὸς αὐτὸς ἐστίν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ⁽¹³⁾, αὐτὸς περὶ οὗ τρανῶς ὁ τῶν προφητῶν χορὸς προεθέσπισε. Διὸ δὴ καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. Mt 20,20-23.

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. Mc 3,17.

⁽⁷⁾ Nominatif absolu? ou sujet de σημαίνει? Dans ce cas, il faut écrire, au début de la phrase, τῷ δὲ au lieu de τὸ δὲ.

⁽⁸⁾ F. DIEKAMP, *Hippolytos von Theben* (1898), p. 6 et 29. Cf. *Auctar. BHG* 779 hb et hd.

⁽⁹⁾ EPIPHANICUS MONACHUS, *Vita Deiparae* (BHG 1049), dans PG 120, 209, § 20. Cf. DIEKAMP, p. 116.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. Jn 18,15.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. Mt 26,18.

⁽¹²⁾ Cf. Jc 1,1.

⁽¹³⁾ Lc 24,21.

Ἰουδαίων, ναὶ δὴ καὶ Ἑλλήνων προσιόντες ἐβαπτίζοντο παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ προσετίθεντο, ἄνδρες ὁμοῦ καὶ γυναῖκες.

3. *Saint Jacques est dénoncé à Hérode.*

Οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι, μὴ φέροντες αὐτοῦ τοὺς [172] ἐλέγχους μηδὲ τὴν ἦταν ἀπενέγκασθαι θέλοντες — ἐπίστευσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων — τῷ Ἡρώδῃ προσιόντες τάχος τῷ Ἀντιπάτρῳ, ὡς Ἰώσηπος ἱστορεῖ⁽¹⁴⁾, τὸν Ἰάκωβον ἤτουν ἀναιρεθῆναι, μὴ στέγοντες ἔτι τὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ προΐοσαν τῶν λόγων βροντήν. Καὶ δὴ καὶ πείθουσιν εἰς τοῦτο χρήμασιν αὐτὸν ὠνησάμενοι. Κλαύδιος ὁ καῖσαρ ἐβασίλευσε τότε. Παραχρῆμα δέ τινα στείλας τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡρώδης ἄγει τοῦτον εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καθὰ δὴ καὶ αἱ Πράξεις δηλοῦσι· «Κατ' ἐκείνον γάρ, φησί, τὸν καιρὸν ἐπέβαλεν Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς χεῖρας κακῶσαι τινὰς τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Ἀνεῖλε δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρα⁽¹⁵⁾». Φησὶ δὲ Κλήμης ὁ Στρωματεὺς⁽¹⁶⁾ ὅτιπερ ὁ ἀποσταλεὶς στρατιώτης [col. 2] ἀγαγεῖν τὸν Ἰάκωβον, κατηχηθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καθ' ὁδὸν τὸ σωτήριον κήρυγμα, θεὸν ὡμολόγησε τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ σὺν αὐτῷ ἀνηρέθη. Πλὴν ἀχθέντος αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἡρώδην, προκαθίσας ἐκεῖνος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος· «Οἱ ἄρχοντες, λέγει τούτῳ, καὶ οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς ἡσοῦν τὸν διδάσκαλον ὑμῶν, βασιλέα λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν καὶ τῷ καίσαρος ἀντιπίπτοντα δόγματι, τῷ Πιλάτῳ παρέδωκαν ἵνα σταυρωθῇ. Καὶ δὴ καὶ σταυρωθέντα τοῦτον καὶ τεθέντα τῷ μνήματι κεκκοφότες ὑμεῖς τὸν ἰδιώτην ὄχλον ἐπλανήσατε ὡς ἡγέρθη ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. Διὸ καὶ πληγαῖς ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς κατακόψαντες παρηγγέλκασι μηδενὶ λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ. Πῶς οὖν αὐτὸς παρρησίᾳ διδάσκεις τοῦτο καὶ [172'] πᾶσαν σχεδὸν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πλανᾷς ἀντιλέγων καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ καίσαρι, βασιλέα καὶ θεὸν τὸν Χριστὸν ὀνομάζων;»

4. *Martyre et sépulture de Jacques. Mort d'Hérode.*

Τοῦ ἀποστόλου τοῖνυν μέλλοντος ἀντιπeseῖν τῷ Ἡρώδῃ, ὁ δηλωθεὶς στρατιώτης, ὃς πιστεύσας κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν προσήλθε Χριστῷ, προλαβὼν τῷ τῆς πίστεως ζέοντι πεπαρρησιασμένῳ τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἐποιήσατο. Διὸ καὶ θυμοῦ μεστός ὁ Ἡρώδης γεγυνώς καὶ μανίας δίδωσιν εὐθὺς κατ' αὐτῶν τὴν ἀπόφασιν· καὶ μαχαίρᾳ φεῦ ὁ καλὸς Ἰάκωβος ἀναιρεῖται καὶ τὸν στέφανον κληροῦται τῆς νίκης. Τότε δὴ τότε τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ Πέτρον ὁ Ἡρώδης ἔθετο, ἀνελεῖν καὶ αὐτὸν βουλευθεὶς, ἀλλὰ θεῖος ἄγγελος αὐτὸν ἐρρύσατο τῶν ἐκείνου χειρῶν, ὡς αἱ Πράξεις παριστῶσι σαφῶς⁽¹⁷⁾.

Ὁ τοῖνυν Ἡρώδης, [col. 2] εἰς τὴν Στράτωνος Καισάρειαν⁽¹⁸⁾ ἀπιών,

(14) Rien de pareil dans l'*Hypomnesticum* de IOSIPPOS (PG 106,16-176). Le passage proviendrait-il d'un chapitre perdu de ce curieux écrit, qui semble remonter à la fin du IV^e siècle? Cf. DIEKAMP, p. 146-147; J. MOREAU, *Byzantion*, 25-27 (1957) 241-276.

(15) Ac 12,1-2.

(16) Cité par EUSÈBE, *H.E.* II, ix, 2-3.

(17) Cf. Ac 12,2-11.

(18) Sur CÉSARÉE DE PALESTINE, voir F. M. ABEL, *Géographie de la Palestine*, t. 2 (1938) 296-297, et les monographies récentes de Levine (en allemand, 1975) et de Ringel (en anglais, 1975).

ἔορτιον πανήγυριν εἰς τιμὴν Κλαυδίου καίσαρος ἄγει. Ἐνθεν τοι καὶ πάντας συναγαγὼν τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτοῦ⁽¹⁹⁾ ἐξουσίαν τοπάρχας καὶ λοιποὺς ἄλλους, βασιλικὴν ἐνδεδυμένος ἐσθῆτα πεποικιλμένην ἐξ ἀργύρου μάλα σοφῶς καὶ ἐντέχνως, ἐφ' ὕψηλῳ τόπου λίαν ἀνῆλθε· καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου τὰς βολὰς ἐπιβάλλοντος αὐτῷ, λαμπρὸς ἐδείκνυτο τοῖς παροῦσι καὶ φοβερός, περὶ τῶν παροξυνάντων αὐτὸν Σιδωνίων διαλεγόμενος⁽²⁰⁾ καὶ οἶονεὶ γανύμενος τῇ στολῇ. Τῶν κολάκων οὖν, οἷα φιλεῖ γίνεσθαι, λεγόντων αὐτῷ ὅτιπερ «Θεὸς σύ, βασιλεῦ, προνοητής, ἀγαθός, εὐεργέτης» κάκεινου μὴ ἐπιτιμήσαντος, ἀλλ' ἡδέως δεχομένου τὰς εὐφημίας, [173] ἄγγελος αὐτὸν ῥομφαίᾳ βάλλει κατὰ γαστρός. Μέγα τοίνυν στενάξας καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν λαὸν ἀπαγγείλας [καὶ] «Ὅν ὑμεῖς, εἶπε⁽²¹⁾, ὥς θεὸν εὐφημεῖτε, ἰδοὺ καταστρέφω» τὴν ζωὴν ἐπωδύνως ἀπέρρηξεν ἐν κακῷ τὴν ψυχὴν⁽²²⁾».

Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου⁽²³⁾, συστειλάντες τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ τοῦ συνάθλου τὰ λείψανα, φιλοτίμως κατέθεντο, πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων θαυμάτων τελεσθέντων ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ.

5. Prière pour l'empereur.

Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν σου, τιμία καὶ ἱερὰ κεφαλῇ, πανθαύμαστε Ἰάκωβε, γόνε βροντῆς καὶ διδάσκαλε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, τὰ διὰ Χριστὸν ἀγωνίσματά τε καὶ παλαιάσματα. Νυνὶ δὲ τῷ τούτου παριστάμενος θρόνῳ καὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἀπολαύων καλῶν, μέμνησο καὶ βασιλέως ἡμῶν τοῦ χρηστοῦ καὶ τὰ [col. 2] πάντα καλοῦ

Μονῶν αἰδίων αὐτῷ χαριζόμενος τὴν κατοίκησιν,
 Ἰλύος παθῶν τὴν ἀπάλειψιν,
 Χώρας δικαίων τὴν κλήρωσιν,
 Ἀύλου δόξης τὴν μέθεξιν,
 Ἡλίου τοῦ τρισσοφαοῦς τὴν ἔλλαμψιν,
 Λειμώνων θείων ἀπόλαυσιν,
 Πάντων⁽²⁴⁾ τῶν καλῶν τὴν μέθεξιν

καὶ βασιλείας θεοῦ τὴν ἐπίτευξιν· ὅτι αὐτῷ Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν πρέπει ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος νῦν καὶ αἰεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

Notice sur le saint apôtre Jacques, le frère de Jean le théologien

1. Comme mon Dieu et maître séjournait sur la terre dans la chair qu'il avait prise de la sainte vierge pour moi son serviteur et comme il se choisissait des disciples témoins et prédicateurs de l'«économie» (la Rédemption),

⁽¹⁹⁾ Αὐτῶν cod.

⁽²⁰⁾ D'où provient ce renseignement? Ce qui précède et ce qui suit est emprunté à Eusèbe; voir la note 22.

⁽²¹⁾ Εἰπὼν cod.

⁽²²⁾ Cf. EUSÈBE, *H.E.* II, x.

⁽²³⁾ Sur Jacques frère du Seigneur, voir *BHG* et *Novum Auctar.* 763y-766p.

⁽²⁴⁾ L'acrostiche désigne Michel IV le Paphlagonien.

André et Pierre, qui avaient entendu parler de ses grands miracles, viennent à lui et se montrent désireux de le suivre. Ensuite, comme il était venu à Génésaret, y annonçait la bonne nouvelle de son royaume et guérissait toute maladie et toute infirmité dans le peuple, Jacques et Jean, les fils de Zébédée, appelés par lui, quittèrent leur père et vinrent à lui eux aussi. Comme il parlait de son royaume (nous venons de le dire), leur mère, se figurant qu'il discourait d'une gloire temporelle, lui adressa ainsi la parole: «Maître, je voudrais que de mes deux fils l'un siège à ta droite et l'autre à ta gauche». Il répondit: «Ce n'est pas à moi qu'il appartient d'attribuer les premières places; elles reviendront à ceux pour qui elles ont été préparées» c'est-à-dire aux (chrétiens) zélés. Comme la mère n'ajoutait rien, l'enseignement du Maître continua. C'est alors qu'il les surnomma *Boanerges* à cause de son affection pour eux et pour leurs vertus. Ce surnom signifie «fils du tonnerre»: prévoyant le retentissement qu'aurait leur prédication, (le Christ) les appela ainsi.

2. Quand Zébédée, le père des deux disciples, fut mort, leur mère s'attacha à la mère du Seigneur. Ils vendirent les grandes propriétés qu'ils avaient en Galilée et achetèrent ainsi à Jérusalem le domaine de Sion, comme le raconte Hippolyte de Thèbes. Le domaine de Sion était important et étendu. Ils louèrent la moitié de l'habitation à Caïphe, le grand-prêtre, qui n'avait pas de logement; car il n'était pas originaire de Jérusalem, mais provenait de Kios en Bithynie. C'est ainsi que Jean était connu du grand-prêtre, comme dit l'Évangile. Jacques et Jean gardèrent pour eux l'autre moitié du domaine; c'est là que le Christ fit la pâque avec ses disciples. N'insistons pas.

Comme s'était accomplie en notre faveur l'«économie» du Dieu Verbe, comme avait eu lieu sa glorieuse ascension et que le Saint Esprit était descendu sur les apôtres, les disciples se partagèrent les pays à évangéliser et chacun d'eux partit pour la région qui lui était échue. Jacques le sage se rendit dans les villes de Judée qui lui avaient été assignées par le sort; il y prêcha la bonne nouvelle, guérit les malades, fit de grands miracles et convertit beaucoup d'auditeurs. Il fréquentait les synagogues des Juifs, y interprétait les lectures des prophètes et de la loi et persuadait à beaucoup de Juifs que le Christ qu'il prêchait était bien celui qui devait libérer Israël, celui dont le chœur des prophètes avait parlé d'avance avec tant de clarté. Aussi beaucoup de Juifs et même de païens se faisaient baptiser par lui et adhéraient au Christ, hommes et femmes.

3. Les Juifs donc, ne pouvant endurer ses reproches et ne voulant pas se laisser battre — car beaucoup de leurs chefs crurent (au Christ) —, allèrent en hâte trouver Hérode Antipatos, comme le raconte Josèphe, et demandèrent qu'il fût exécuté; ils ne supportaient plus le tonnerre de blâmes qui sortait de sa bouche. Ils réussirent à le persuader en lui offrant de l'argent. L'empereur Claude régnait alors. Hérode lui envoie un émissaire, qui revient à Jérusalem (avec des instructions formelles); suivant le récit des Actes, Hérode entreprit à ce moment-là de maltraiter quelques (chefs) de l'Église; il fit périr Jacques, frère de Jean, par le glaive. Clément, l'auteur des «Stromates», rapporte que le soldat chargé d'amener Jacques fut catéchisé par lui en route, confessa que le Christ était Dieu, fut baptisé par Jacques et décapité avec lui. Or donc, comme on l'avait amené devant Hérode, celui-ci, siégeant à son tribunal, lui

dit: «Les chefs (des Juifs) et les grands-prêtres (ont jugé) votre maître Jésus, qui se prétendait roi et s'opposait ainsi à l'autorité de l'empereur; ils l'ont livré à Pilate pour qu'il fût crucifié. Après la crucifixion et la mise au tombeau, vous avez volé le corps et fait croire au peuple ignorant qu'il était ressuscité des morts. C'est pourquoi les grands-prêtres vous ont châtiés et vous ont interdit de prêcher en ce nom-là. Comment donc oses-tu enseigner ouvertement cette doctrine et tromper presque toute la Judée, t'opposant toi aussi à l'empereur, puisque tu donnes au Christ les titres de roi et de Dieu?»

4. L'apôtre allait répondre à Hérode, mais le soldat converti en route le devança. Dans l'ardeur de sa foi, il fit une réponse pleine de franchise. Hérode, emporté par une folle colère, prononce la sentence contre les deux (chrétiens). Saint Jacques, décapité, reçoit la couronne de la victoire. C'est alors qu'Hérode fit emprisonner saint Pierre; il voulait aussi le condamner à mort, mais un ange de Dieu l'arracha de ses mains, comme les Actes l'expliquent en détail.

Hérode se rendit à Césarée de Straton pour y célébrer de grandes fêtes en l'honneur de l'empereur Claude. Entouré de tous les roitelets qui dépendaient de lui et revêtu d'une magnifique parure royale ornée d'argent, il monta sur une haute colline où les rayons du soleil faisaient briller ses ornements et le rendaient redoutable, tandis que, tout fier de sa tunique, il discutait avec les rebelles de Sidon. Les flatteurs lui disaient: «Père, vous êtes un dieu, une providence, un bienfaiteur plein de bonté». Il les laissait dire et agréait leurs compliments. Mais un ange le frappa de son épée en plein ventre. Poussant de grands soupirs, il confessa devant le peuple: «Celui que vous honorez comme Dieu, voici qu'il bouleverse ma vie dans la souffrance et qu'il me fait mourir de malemort».

Jean l'évangéliste et Jacques le frère du Seigneur recueillirent les restes de l'apôtre, leur compagnon de lutte, et les enterrèrent avec honneur. Beaucoup de grands miracles se produisirent sur sa tombe.

5. Tels furent, ô vénérable et très admirable Jacques, fils du tonnerre et docteur des Églises, tes combats et tes luttes pour le Christ. Maintenant que tu es proche du trône céleste et que tu jouis des plus grands biens, souviens-toi de notre excellent et parfait empereur. Accorde-lui d'habiter les demeures éternelles, efface les souillures des passions. Qu'il ait part à la terre des justes et à la gloire immatérielle. Que brille pour lui le soleil à la triple lumière (la Trinité), qu'il jouisse des divins pâturages, qu'il participe à tous les biens et obtienne le royaume de Dieu. Car c'est au Christ notre Dieu qu'appartient la gloire et la puissance maintenant et toujours et pour les siècles des siècles, amen.

RECENSIONES

Varia

Jack FINEGAN, *The Archeology of the New Testament* [II.] *The Mediterranean World of the Early Christian Apostles*. xxxii-250 p.; 126 photos; 22 maps. Boulder, CO — London 1981. Westview Press — Croom Helm. £ 19.95.

The author's companion-volume entitled *The Archaeology of the New Testament: the Life of Jesus and the Beginning of the Early Church* was published by Princeton University in 1969 (paperback 1978) on the understanding that the part dealing with Paul and regions outside Palestine was being prepared by another author. Since this never materialized, Finegan finally gave himself and the scholarly world the satisfaction of filling this yawning gap. There are some limited but relevant facts which might suggest that the archeology of the Epistles and latter Acts is the *only* New Testament archeology, in part because both Jesus himself and the Evangelists are considered by some experts to have deliberately obscured the connection of his message with purely material localities, in part because the relatively little we know by excavation about the NT period is simply a minor area of the background of the religious users of the Old Testament. While stressing these points in our recent "Is There a New Testament Archaeology?" in the Festschrift for Settimio Cipriani (*Parola e Spirito* [Brescia 1982] 689-721) we went on to detail the specifically *Gospel* and *Palestine* contributions of archeology: which we mention here to guard the reader against taking the *subtitle* of the present work as a *synonym* of the title, in default of the [II.] or any similar specification on the title-page or cover.

As Finegan's preface amply notes, the limitations of this volume make it virtually a travelogue-commentary on the Journeys of Paul, with John and Peter looming up at their opportune but brief moment. For this reason the author suggests that we skip the first two chapters and begin with the (naturally) "Beginnings", p. 51. This warning was a well-founded and well-intentioned one, like a "Wet Paint" sign, which will probably induce the normally-perverse reader like myself to stick out a gingerly finger and verify whether it is really so. The result is that the opening pages on "Sources" turn out to be so fascinating and readable that only a hardy spirit could break away once he has started. Indeed, even prior to this "first chapter" is an "alphabetical list of ancient sources", which also makes flowing and fascinating reading matter: the names are all so familiar yet so vague, at least in their specific relevance to Paul's Journeys. No less flowing and readable is the second

chapter, entitled "Chronological History". Why then did the author try to deter us? Because the secret poison is that we end up head-down in and out of chronological periods long after what would normally furnish a "Beginning". Sample: the very first map in the whole book is of *Spain*! and the second is of the Vatican. And the very first four photos are of Patmos. If he didn't want us to read this part, why put this bait? The worst is, though, that an almost complete treatment of everything that is to be said about the *death* of Paul, in its relation to the ministry and death of Peter, is lavishly and very informatively treated on twenty pages before we have ever been let in on the secret that Paul *exists*. Thereupon John gets a dozen pages, largely dealing with Ephesus and without so much as passing mention of the tenuous hypothesis of Mary there — which no one would protest, save for the fact that on p. 164 Ephesus resurfaces with *lots* about Mary, indeed virtual acceptance of the hypothesis on p. 168. But of course all these upside-downnesses never would have happened if we had only followed the author's sensible advice to begin at the "Beginnings".

If we think back on the various books we have read which have "Archeology" as the key-word of their title, we realize how numerous and dissimilar are the various possible approaches. Often the chief excavated or explored sites are presented, in the order of development of modern techniques, or in topographical clusters radiating out from a center like Antioch, or in alphabetical order. In other cases the order of ancient history is followed, narrating what happened from the earliest to the latest date, with insertion of the excavated data at the opportune point no matter where or when they may have been discovered. This volume (when once it gets to the "Beginnings") would fit rather this latter pattern. Yet it contains so largely *historical* an outlook, descriptively geographical as well, and indeed with a very liberal sprinkling of purely textual philology, that we might tend to consider it just a lively well-informed up-to-date *travelogue*, and forget or not care that it claims to be An Archeology. Our point is not that things ought to be called by their right names; but rather that the nature of the materials is such that there seems to be no other easily accessible way of presenting them.

The maps are numerous and crystal-clear, and occur just at the point where they are most needed. The photographs also are numerous and where they belong; but alas they belong to that peculiarly American fuzzy-gray style of reproduction whose goal seems to be chiefly to preclude pirating. On p. 29 it came as news to me that the Trappists owned and excavated St. Paul's outside the walls. The hypothesis advanced on p. 15 that the "Theophilus" to whom Luke addressed his double volume was no less than the philosopher Seneca was equally arresting. Efforts to find in the name Claudia of p. 13 a non-sexist nod for the emperor above and below called Claudius are doubtless futile, but may help to keep the flame alive.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

Robert NORTH S.J.

Kathleen M. KENYON (†) edited by Thomas A. HOLLAND, *Excavations at Jericho, Volume III. The Architecture and Stratigraphy of the Tell*, with contributions by R. Burleigh, I. W. Cornwall, G. Kurth, and O. Röhrer-Ertl. Text, xxvii-540 p.; 17 figs. (4 maps; tables); IX plates. Volume of Plates, xxxii p. (lists and errata), 202 plates of photographs, 203-343 drawings. London 1981. British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.

"Chapters I to IX of the present report were completed by Dame Kathleen before her untimely death in August 1978... *Jericho IV* will contain studies of the pottery and small finds... and general conclusions [she had hoped to include everything in *Jericho III*, but three more years of research would have been required in a period of rapidly rising costs; so this volume] is mainly concerned with the architecture and stratigraphy of the sites" (from the Editor's Preface, p. xi). It will be of immediate interest to readers of *Biblica* to know that neither there nor anywhere else in the volume is anything said regarding the massive exegetical problem of the date or place of the destruction of Jericho recorded in the book of Joshua; Joshua indeed occurs in the Index for the single reference of p. 15, which tells us that Garstang's dating of the "double brick wall" to a rather early Joshua-date around 1400 must be corrected to some 600 years earlier; this lament is in fact anticipated p. 1, but without corresponding renvoi in the Index. — To complete this parenthesis, a detailed tracing of Dame Kenyon's own last relevant published statements may be found in my two researches, "The Ghasulian Lacuna at Jericho" in *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan I*, 1980 Oxford conference edited by Adnan Hadidi (Amman 1982) 59-66; and more generally defending her against any suspicion of the "archeological apologetics" now widely attacked: *Festschrift for Settimio Cipriani, Parola e Spirito* (Brescia 1982) 690-697.

Whatever one may think about the legitimacy or success of drawing conclusions about Biblical historicity from archeological excavations, no exegete can fail to have a judicious and unprejudiced interest in such an imposing double volume published after all under the name of Jericho, and containing the results attained by one whom most experts probably considered the most competent excavator of her time.

The first chapter gives a brief introduction to the history of excavation at Tell es-Sultān, telling very little about the results of Sellin and Watzinger (or even Garstang) or the fierce controversies which these provoked among the leading archeologists of the 1930s (neither Albright nor Vincent is in the Index); some of this would have been helpful or even necessary to interpret fully Dame Kenyon's own discoveries.

These in turn are not presented in any overall chronological synthesis, but in eight chapters on eight different excavated areas, as if these had been separate villages with a life of their own only loosely connected to the environing ones. In the Main Trench, after an eleven-page preview, some 75 pages are devoted to the pre-pottery neolithic periods; occasional longer para-

graphs give noteworthy or even exciting descriptions of what was happening in the real life of the settlement, but the general subdivisions are so numerous and noncommittal that the reader is left wondering when "the real story" of the important and long-lived site known as Sulṭān is ever going to be told. The pottery-utilizing periods from neolithic through Iron Age (without any LB) all together take up only 20 pages, and have few if any "action-sequences".

The next chapter is entitled "Trench II, Site O", and though Trench II is prominent on all four maps (the Garstang neolithic northeast corner), flanked in Map 1 by the letters L, N, X, and Y, it is not really clear whether O is just a symbol or synonym of Trench II itself (a rich variety of symbols within the chapter all begin with O: OO, OAB, OBH etc.). The reference to thumb-impressed bricks, which in 1953 it had been my own good fortune to discover for the first time as a supervisor in this area, leads me to dream that the architecture is that which the other supervisors commonly referred to as a "sanctuary", for reasons which I published in *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 27 (1953) 325-337 [not mentioned in the bibliography p. XXIII, though my *Biblica* article with the thumb-imprinted bricks is]. But the only excitement to which this chapter gives rise is a five-page variation in typography to show how "accumulation begin to build up in the pits": a wearying objectivity which must leave the reader wondering whether archeology can be true to itself only at the expense of ruthless elimination of human-interest. However, on p. 273 there is indeed reference to "some sort of shrine or sanctuary" in one of the four squares called E slightly south of Trench II; but this is attributed to Mesolithic hunters because of carbon-dating, and my casual scrutiny showed no prominence of the niche-column, upright skull, or polished plaster floors which had formed part of the "neolithic sanctuary" hypothesis bandied about by my 1953 co-workers.

On p. 371 a momentous statement is made: "The evidence is enough to say that there was occupation here [Square H nearest the watersource] in the second half of the Late Bronze Age, but nothing more than that". A single juglet, "probably fourteenth century", is the only cited evidence. It had in fact been well known among us that a "negligibly tiny" (and probably nearer to 1500) Late Bronze deposit was found in that area, on which therefore all really *empirical* hopes of a Joshua-era occupation were pinned; but Dame Kenyon's own published statements virtually ignored this in her (temporary at least) proposal that all the Joshua-remains here had been carried away by "wind and rain".

Can we hope for more in the line of historical reconstruction in the brief space allotted to "Conclusions" in the forthcoming Volume IV on Jericho Pottery?

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

Robert NORTH S. J.

Gregorio DEL OLMO LETE, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaán según la tradición de Ugarit*. Textos, versión y estudio (Institución San Jerónimo para la Investigación Bíblica; Fuentes de la Ciencia Bíblica, 1) 699 págs. 25×15. Madrid 1981. Ediciones Cristiandad/Institución San Jerónimo.

Conocido entre los ugaritólogos por sus trabajos de investigación publicados en *Ugarit-Forschungen* y otras revistas científicas, G. del Olmo Lete, profesor de la Universidad de Barcelona, da aquí cima a la esforzada empresa de reeditar, traducir y esclarecer los textos poéticos de Ugarit.

En la «Introducción general» el A. a) declara el *objetivo* de su obra (pp. 19-23); b) informa sobre el *descubrimiento* de Ugarit, de los archivos y las tablillas (pp. 23-31); c) dilucida la *morfología literaria* de los textos (pp. 31-62); d) esboza el *universo mitológico* de Ugarit (pp. 63-74); e) señala, finalmente, indiscutibles conexiones entre *Ugarit y el Antiguo Testamento* (pp. 74-78).

Resalta en esta parte introductoria la sección titulada «Morfología literaria», donde el A. analiza *formas y fórmulas* ligadas a situaciones características y recurrentes. Consta de tres apartados: a) lenguaje descriptivo; b) lenguaje dialógico; c) lenguaje mixto descriptivo-dialógico. A propósito del *lenguaje descriptivo*, el A. presta atención a las escenas de banquete, de sacrificio, de combate, de viaje, de rito y magia, de duelo y amor. Distingue tres grupos de *formas dialógicas*: a) diálogos; b) alocuciones volitivas (imprecaciones, conjuros, amenazas, reproches, bendiciones, promesas); c) alocuciones descriptivas (lamentos, monólogos, instrucciones, exhortaciones, invocaciones, plegarias, votos, himnos, antifonas, invitatorios, exclamaciones, exaltaciones de la amada, catálogos de virtudes, oráculos). Como formas de *lenguaje mixto* descriptivo-dialógico considera: a) el mensaje; b) la reacción; c) el conjuro; d) las formas binarias: orden-ejecución, invitación-aceptación, deliberación-comunicación. El A. ilustra cada una de estas formas y clichés con ejemplos ugaríticos y a menudo con referencias bíblicas.

Constituyen el cuerpo de la obra los textos siguientes: Ciclo mitológico de *Ba'lu-'Anatu* (KTU I. 1-6); epopeyas de *Kirta* (KTU I. 14-16) y *Aqhatu* (KTU I. 17-19); saga de los *Rapauma* (KTU I. 20-22); poemas mítico-rituales de «Los dioses apuestos y hermosos» (KTU I. 23) y «Las bodas de *Yarhu* y *Nikkal*» (KTU I. 24); mitemas de «Los amores de *Ba'lu* y *'Anatu*» (KTU I. 10-11), «Combate de *Ba'lu* y los dioses del desierto» (KTU I. 12) y «La Virgen-Madre *Anatu*» (KTU I. 13).

El A. presenta, en doble columna, el *texto* original transliterado, dispuesto esticométricamente, y la *versión* española. A pie de página figuran dos cuerpos de notas: en el primero se consignan *variantes de lectura*, enmiendas e integraciones conjeturales; en el segundo se recogen *distintas interpretaciones* de otros autores.

En las amplias introducciones particulares a los poemas, el A. a) se ocupa del *texto*: descripción de las tablillas, peculiaridades paleográficas, ediciones previas; b) lleva a cabo un minucioso *análisis literario*: contextura gene-

ral del poema, articulación de las escenas, motivos literarios, observaciones estilísticas, etc.; c) discute sobriamente el *sentido y función* de la pieza.

De los fragmentos mitológicos KTU 1. 7, 8, 9 y 25 se reproduce sólo el texto transliterado.

En el «Glosario» (pp. 509-645) el A. dispone alfabéticamente los lexemas que aparecen en los textos editados; ofrece material comparativo; justifica filológicamente su versión e informa de otras opciones posibles.

Completan el volumen repertorios de siglas bibliográficas (pp. 649-662) y de signos y abreviaturas generales (pp. 663-665); elenco de citas bíblicas (pp. 667s.); índices de autores (pp. 669-682), nombres de lugar (pp. 682s.), personas (pp. 683-685) y divinidades (pp. 685-688); índice de materias (pp. 689-699).

En los párrafos que siguen ofrezco un haz de observaciones, de índole fundamentalmente filológica, motivadas por la lectura del libro que reseño.

Soy menos propenso que Del Olmo a corregir el texto transmitido por los escribas de Ugarit. Ante el intercambio no fonemático *b/p*, el A. adopta una postura ambigua. En efecto, si juzga errónea la grafía *šbh*, l. 14 VI 25, «estirpe», no se pronuncia en cambio sobre las variantes *lbš-lpš* en l. 12 II 46, *klbš. km lpš.dm.a[hh]*, «pues vistió como vestido la sangre de sus hermanos». Los ejemplos allegados por M. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology*, p. 9, (citado por el A., p. 243, n. 18), muestran la amplitud de este hecho fonético en ugarítico. Gad B. Sarpatti, *Maarav* 3 (1982) 69s., presenta testimonios del intercambio *b/p* en hebreo epigráfico, bíblico y misnaico, así como en fenicio. La grafía *r'b'*, KAI 131, «médico», documenta el mismo fenómeno en neopúnico.

Puede que *yak*, l. 4 V 41, y *bakt*, l. 19 II 20, no sean simples escrituras mendosas de *ylak* y *baklt*, sino testimonios de una articulación débil, tal vez vocálica, de la /l/. Un fenómeno análogo se registra en los vocablos eblaitas 'à-a-gú-um (cf. G. Pettinato, *M[ateriali] E[pigrafici di] E[bla]* 4, 9-11 v. VIII 4), /ha(l)āk-um/, «ir»; iš_x-ga-um (*MEE* 4, 4-6 v. V 15; 9-11 r. XI' 8'), /'iškā(l)-um/, «racimo», etc.; véase a este propósito H.-P. Müller, en *La lingua di Ebla* (L. Cagni, ed.; Napoli 1981), p. 232. Sospecho asimismo que *kt*, l. 3 VI 18, (=kt(r)), y *yṭb*, l. 19 III 2, (=yṭb(r)), denuncian la relajación del fonema no representado en la escritura.

El A., que admite como variantes *hd* y *hdd*, «Haddu», y da entrada en el glosario a las formas gemelas *rb* II y *rbb*, «orvallo», *rbt* y *rbbt*, «miriada», cae en inconsecuencia enmendando en el aparato crítico las palabras *al*, l. 19 I 37, «ropa», escrita otras veces *all*, y *rbt*, l. 3 I 17. Tan correcta es la grafía *lrbt* (/ *lalpm*), l. 14 II 40, «por miriadas» (/ *«por miles»*), como *lrbbt* (/ *lalpm*), l. 4 I 28. El nombre *kl* aparece más de una vez con la segunda consonante desdoblada; sirva de ejemplo *kl ylh_m bh*, l. 115:10, «tous en mangeront» (versión de Ch. Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* V, p. 586). Bien conocidas son en hebreo las formas *hr/hrr*, *lb/lbb*, *šl/šll*, etc. También en eblaita la geminación de las consonantes está a veces representada gráficamente y a veces no; cf. G. Pettinato, *Ebla. Un impero inciso nell'argilla* (Milano 1979), p. 68.

Reconociendo en *lhmd* la partícula corroborativa *l-*, K. Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen*, I (AOAT 21/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1974), p. 33, traduce lisamente, sin alterar el texto, *gb' m.lhmd.hrs*, l. 4 V 39, «die Hügel das

Schönste, fürwahr, an Gold». Véase también J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (Berlin ³1967), nº 1423. De la semejanza de este colon con *gb' m.mhmd hrš*, l. 4 V 32s., no se sigue necesariamente que *lhmd* sea error por *mhmd*. Recordemos las expresiones equivalentes *kele hemdā*, 2 Cr 32,27, «objetos preciosos», y *kele mahāmaddēha*, 2 Cr 36,19. La pareja *hmd/mhmd* se alinea con *lbs/mlbš*, *'rb/m'rb*, *pḥr/mpḥrt*, *šd/mšd*, etc.

La versión de l. 17 I 18, *din.bn.lh*, «el que no tiene hijo», no refleja el matiz causal que parece tener aquí el determinativo-relativo *d*, como a veces el hebreo *āšer*. Compárese *wn[.fin.attf.l]k*, l. 2 III 22, donde el A., percibiendo el valor causal de *wn*, traslada con acierto «Pues no tienes mujer».

A propósito de *y'rr.wy'n yrḥ* // *nyr šmm.wn'n*, l. 24:30s., anota el A. la posibilidad de que *wn'n* constituya un error. A mi entender, el grupo consonántico *wn'n* está formado por el infinitivo absoluto 'n, precedido de *wn* con función enfática: «Excitose y replicó Yarḥu, // la lumbrera celeste en verdad replicó». Este análisis hace ver el paralelismo *yqtl* // inf. abs. del reiterado verbo 'ny.

El *wāw* inicial de *wšd.šd.ilm*, l. 23:13, no creo que sea adversativo, sino vocativo: «¡Oh campo, campo divino!», como ha observado M. Dahood, *Psalms* II (AB 17; Garden City, N.Y. 1968), p. 204. Esta exclamación coral retorna simplificada en la l. 28, *šd.ilm*, sin *wāw* y sin repetición afectiva. La misma función desempeña el *wāw* en *ūšedē tērūmōt*, 2 Sam 1,21, «O upland fields!», según interpretación de M. Dahood, *Bib* 53 (1972) 398; cf. J. P. Fokelman, *ZAW* 91 (1979) 291, que traduce así mismo «o high fields!». Vocativo es, en mi concepto, el *wāw* que introduce la invocación epistolar *w.mlk.b'ly*, KTU 2.33:22, de suerte que en la versión de E. Lipiński, *OrLov-Per* 12 (1981) 103, «Et, ô roi, mon seigneur!» huelga la conjunción «et».

El paralelismo del sufijo pronominal -n y del sintagma preposicional *ly*, documentado en el bicolon *bn.al.tbkn*. // *al tdm.ly*, l. 16 I 25s., se refleja nítidamente en la traducción del A., «Hijo mío, no me llores, // no gimas por mí». En la versión de *tbkn.wtdm.ly*, l. 30, «ella llorará y gemirá por mí», se echa en cambio de menos el pronombre correspondiente al sufijo de *tbkn*.

La traducción de *hw.ybl.argmnk*, l. 2 I 37, «El te aportará un tributo», muestra cómo el sufijo de *argmnk* desempeña función de dativo. Teniendo en cuenta que el sufijo de *bhty* ejerce el mismo oficio en *bhty.bnt [dt.ksp.]*, l. 4 VIII 35s., la versión «Me he construido una casa [de plata]» aventaja tal vez a la que da el A., «Mi casa [de plata] he construido». El sintagma paralelo de *ybl.argmnk* es *ybl. . . mnhyk*, l. 38, con el cual es instructivo confrontar *yôbilûn minḥâtî*, Sof 3:10, «me traerán ofrendas» (NBE).

Sin menoscabo del rigor filológico podrían suprimirse, entre otros, los paréntesis en que el A. encierra la preposición «con» empleada para trasladar el acusativo de materia, modo o instrumento; por ejemplo, *tl.šmm*, l. 3 II 39; IV 43, «(con) rocío del cielo». En el bicolon *kry 'mt 'pr* // *'zm.yd ugrm*, l. 12 I 23ss., interpretado por el A. «Clava (tus) codos en tierra, // los antebrazos en el suelo», me inclino a pensar que *amt* y *'zm yd* son acusativos de medio: «Escarba la tierra con el codo, // el campo con mano robusta». Sobre *'zm yd* derrama luz el enlace verbal *'ôšem yad* (Dt 8:17; Job 30:21), conforme ha señalado M. Dahood, en *Ras Shamra Parallels*, vol. III (S. Rummel, ed.; AnOr 51; Roma 1981) I 230. El sintagma *ma-ḥa-šî i-da* (MEE 4, 73 v.

III 6), /*maḥāši 'ida*/, «golpear con la mano», atestigua el acusativo de medio en eblaita. Compárese *yd.mḥšt.aq[h]t.ḡzr*, l. 19 IV 58s., «la mano que hirió al Prócer *Aghatu*».

Nos sorprende que el A. mutile el texto de *kb'l.kyḥwy.y'šr. // ḥwy.y'šr.wyšqynh*, l. 17 VI 30s., considerando ditográficos los dos primeros vocablos del segundo segmento. El bicolon tiene buen sentido, como muestra la reciente versión de P. Xella, *Gli antenati di Dio. Divinità e miti della tradizione di Canaan* (Verona 1982), p. 200: «Proprio come Baal quando fa rivivere. // offre ospitalità a chi è richiamato in vita, // offre ospitalità e gli porge da bere»; véase ya A. Caquot-M. Sznycer, *Textes Ougaritiques*, I (Paris 1974), p. 432; sobre todo M. Dahood, *Psalms I* (AB 16; Garden City, N.Y. 1966), p. 221s.; *Psalms III* (AB 17A; Garden City, N.Y. 1970), p. XLVIII, con la esticometría correcta.

El autor, procurando mantenerse «literalmente fiel» al texto original (p. 15), consigue una traducción ceñida y flúida, clara y expresiva. Del criterio adoptado se aparta cuando elude repeticiones verbales; ejemplos: *arš // arš*, l. 4 VIII 8s., «tierra» // «abismo»; *[b]mt 'r // bmt.phl*, l. 19 II 10s., «lomos del jumento» // «grupa del asno»; *bdh // bdh*, l. 23:8, «en su mano» // en ella»; *mšb.mznm // kp.mznm*, l. 24:34s., «la barra de la balanza» // «los platillos de la misma»; *ky'n // wy'n*, l. 17 V 11s., «sí que vio» // «contempló»; *yph // yph*, l. 19 II 13s., «vio» // «atisbó»; al triple *gpn* epifórico de l. 23:9-11 corresponden tres vocablos distintos, «cepa», «vid», «sarmiento». Dudo que de este modo se amenice la lectura y tengo por cierto que un rasgo de estilo se oscurece.

A este libro, que entró en prensa a los cincuenta años del descubrimiento de Ugarit, cuando apenas balbucía la lengua de Ebla, cabe el honor de clausurar en cierto modo una etapa. En efecto, si Del Olmo menciona una sola vez el eblaita (p. 529, *brḥ*), en los próximos decenios los ugaritólogos deberán prestar asidua atención al tesoro léxico de Ebla, que empieza ya a mostrarse ayuda eficaz. Tan arduo es el problema planteado por *nzl* en el sintagma *lḥmh.dnzl*, l. 14 III 58, que ninguno de los conatos interpretativos puede considerarse satisfactorio. La clave de la solución está probablemente en un texto de Ebla que exhibe la equivalencia *sag-i-giš = ni-zi-lu* (MEE 4, 24 r. V 11s.). Si *i-giš*, como es sabido, significa «aceite» y *sag* sirve para ponderar la calidad -igual que *rō's* y *rē'sīt* en hebreo, *riš* en ugarítico, *r'st* en fenicio, el lexema sumérico y su correspondiente glosa eblaita quieren decir «aceite óptimo, exquisito, de primera». M. Dahood, en *La lingua di Ebla*, p. 180, identificando el ugarítico *nzl* con el eblaita /*nizil-u*/, esclarece el sentido de *lḥmh.dnzl*, «his bread made of oil». Esta interpretación encuentra apoyo en el enlace nominal *leḥem šemen* (Ex 29,23; Lev 8,26), pan amasado (*blḥ*) o acaso untado (*mšh*) con aceite (cf. Ex 29,2; Lev 2,4; 7,12; Nm 6,15).

Elogiaríamos sin reservas el esmero tipográfico del libro, pulcramente impreso y bien encuadernado, si estuviera exento de erratas. En la transliteración del texto ugarítico hemos advertido las siguientes: KTU 1.3 I 18, *ydb*, léase *ybd* (p. 180); l. 4 IV 59, *ank*, l. *an* (//*ank*; p. 201); l. 5 I 26, *iṭn'k*, l. *iṭ'nk* (p. 215); II 16, *aršš*, l. *arš* (p. 217); l. 6 I 18; *aršš*, l. *arš* (p. 224); l. 14 III 17, *nqht*, l. *nhqt* (p. 295); 35, *w'db*, l. *w'bd* (p. 296); 48, *šph*, l. *šph*

(p. 296); VI 19, *w'db*, l. *w'bd* (p. 301); I. 16 IV 12, *ngrt.t*, l. *ngrt* (p. 317); I. 17 I 33, *npšn*, l. *npšh* (p. 369); V 8, *tpt*, l. *tpt* (p. 374); I. 19 IV 12, *kdd*, l. *lkdd* (p. 397); I. 23:8, *dbh*, l. *bdh* (p. 441); 48, *wšhrt*, l. *wšhrt* (p. 445); 66, *tgrg*, l. *tgrgr* (p. 447). Yerrores tipográficos en la versión de los poemas: KTU I. 4 I 11, «com olos», léase «como los» (p. 193); I. 14 VI 22s., «lo que hay», l. «lo que no hay» (p. 301); I. 17 I 16, «se acertó», l. «se acercó» (p. 368); I. 22 I 17, «en es día», l. «en ese día» (p. 424). Son agravios a la ortografía los errores siguientes: «se incho» por «se hinchó» (I. 3 II 25, p. 181); «humbral» por «umbral» (p. 312, 2º cuerpo de notas); «alaga» por «halaga» (p. 381, 2º cuerpo de notas); «acerbo lexicográfico» por «acervo...» (p. 507); «bóveda» por «bóveda» (p. 533, *gp*); «varnizar» por «barnizar» (p. 537, *dm* II); «advervial» por «adverbial» (p. 542, *hn* III).

La bibliografía que el A. maneja es copiosa y actualizada. Escrupulosamente atento a la producción científica, Del Olmo ofrece a cada paso referencias que facilitan indagaciones personales. En este punto resulta más fácil señalar exuberancia que omisiones. En efecto, tal vez podría aligerarse el segundo cuerpo de notas, prescindiendo de las interpretaciones más endebles y peregrinas.

Tanto en la introducción general como en las particulares el A. remite con frecuencia a pasajes del AT que testimonian instituciones sociales, usos y costumbres, gestos y ritos, escenas y situaciones, motivos y rasgos, fórmulas y clichés, procedimientos estilísticos, estructuras y formas literarias parangonables con las documentadas en los poemas de Ugarit. Con deliberada parquedad cita, en el primer cuerpo de notas, textos de la Biblia hebrea que exhiben idéntica fraseología. En el glosario inserta referencias ocasionales a lugares bíblicos de interés para la discusión de algún lexema ugarítico.

En *Mitos y leyendas de Canaán*, desplegando madurez de juicio al par que agudeza de ingenio, Del Olmo ofrece una interpretación luminosa y coherente de la poesía mitológica y épica de Ugarit. Si el libro, de indisputable entidad científica, obtiene de los estudiosos el favor que merece, no tardando mucho será necesaria otra edición, cuidadosamente revisada y limpia de erratas enojosas y extraviantes. No podemos terminar sin congratularnos con el Prof. Del Olmo por esta obra, densa y erudita, que han de agradecerle no sólo los ugaritólogos, sino también los biblistas interesados en el trasfondo cananeo de la literatura de Israel.

Via Giulia, 151
00186 Roma

Eduardo ZURRO

Vetus Testamentum

Leonhard GOPPELT, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (translated by Donald H. Madvig). Pp. xxiii+264. Grand Rapids 1982. Eerdmans. \$ 19.95.

This work constitutes Leonhard Goppelt's doctoral dissertation submitted to the theological faculty of Erlangen University. It was originally published by C. Bertelsmann Verlag (Gütersloh) in 1939 under the title, *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen*. Thirty years later it was reissued with a recent article of Goppelt's (TLZ 89 [1964] 321-344) appended as a final chapter. Shortly before Goppelt's death in December, 1973, E. Earle Ellis received the author's permission to publish an English translation. After a few years the task was completed by Donald H. Madvig with his customary competence. Ellis has provided the volume with a helpful Foreword. English readers are indebted to the efforts of these men.

Although now more than forty years old Goppelt's work is particularly relevant in biblical studies today in view of the increasing interest in the function of the OT in the New and how the two testaments relate to each other. In the first chapter Goppelt introduces the reader to the history of scholarship concerned with the question of how the two testaments relate and how typology should be defined. In chapters two and three typology in various Jewish traditions (i.e., Palestinian and Hellenistic) is studied. Chapter four studies christological typology in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts while chapter five studies ecclesiological typology in the same writings. Chapter six is devoted to typology in Paul; chapter seven to typology in Hebrews; and chapter eight to typology in John. Chapter nine constitutes the conclusion to the original work. Goppelt concludes that typology, unlike allegory, is not concerned "to find the meaning of some OT story or institution" (p. 201), but is concerned to show how redemptive history has been repeated and heightened by God's redemptive activity in Christ and the Church (pp. 199-202). "Typology is the method of interpreting Scripture that is predominant in the NT and characteristic of it" (p. 198) and "... is the means regularly employed to relate the present to redemptive history in the past" (p. 200). Chapter ten is Goppelt's later article on typology and apocalypticism in Paul in which he shows that Paul's apocalypticism is informed by his typological exegesis of the OT.

In several important areas Goppelt's work anticipates and makes useful contributions to current studies. For example, recently H. Shires (*Finding the Old Testament in the New* [Philadelphia 1974]) has delineated four basic ways in which the OT appears in the NT: (1) citation with formula; (2) citation without formula; (3) key words and phrases; and (4) themes and images. Going beyond Shires, J. A. Sanders ("The Ethic of Election in Luke's Great

Banquet Parable", *Essays in Old Testament Ethics* [eds. J. Crenshaw and J. Willis; New York 1974] 247-271, and "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4", *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* [Morton Smith Festschrift; ed. J. Neusner; Leiden 1975] 75-106) has explored some of the various ways in which OT theology, structures, and arrangement are expressed in the NT. Goppelt shows the same kind of sensitivity when he states: "Far too much emphasis has been placed on actual quotations" (p. 198). Rather, the emphasis should be placed on themes and structure.

With respect to the phenomena of quotations in the NT S. V. McCasland ("Matthew Twists the Scriptures", *JBL* 80 [1961] 143-148) and C. Goodwin ("How Did John Treat His Sources?", *JBL* 74 [1954] 61-75) would have done well to heed Goppelt's observation that too much has been made over the degree of verbal exactitude: "Much of the NT abounds with allusions to the OT that have little resemblance to the exact wording" (p. 198). It is the presence of these allusions and inexact quotations that should point us to underlying themes and structures rather than lead us to the conclusion that the evangelists have misunderstood and/or misused their sources as McCasland and Goodwin suppose. Goppelt notes that most of these allusions "are intended to evoke comparison with the OT passages that they call to mind" (p. 199). This observation is particularly a propos the studies of Sanders mentioned above.

In yet one other important area Goppelt's work makes a significant contribution. With respect to canonical criticism Sanders ("Canonical Context and Canonical Criticism", *HBT* 2 [1980] 173-197) differs from B. S. Childs ("Response", *HBT* 2 [1980] 199-211) in his understanding of how early exegetes interpreted Scripture. For these exegetes, Sanders argues, the Bible is interpreted as "oracle" whereby individual verses are subject to interpretation with little concern for literary context. Goppelt's study provides numerous illustrations of this point. In fact, typological exegesis appears to be based upon that very point Sanders has made. The Bible, understood as oracle, can be mined and sifted in the search for redemptive types that clarify the experiences of Christ and his community.

Although *Typos* is dated, especially in view of the enormous strides recently made in our understanding of rabbinic Judaism and midrash, as well as sectarian Judaism as revealed by the discoveries around the Dead Sea, it is, nevertheless, an important work bearing much relevance for the current discussion of the relation between the testaments. Moreover, *Typos* abounds with insightful exegesis of particular NT passages, a fact alone which makes the volume well worth reading.

Trinity Western College
7600 Glover Road
Langley, British Columbia
Canada V3A 4R9

Craig A. EVANS

M. A. BEEK, *Jozua* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament). 256 p. (e una cartina nel testo). Nijkerk 1981. G. G. Callenbach Fl 63,50.

Questo notevole contributo all'esegesi del libro di Giosuè appare in una collana contenente commentari ad indirizzo omiletico e catechetico; ciò rende l'opera particolarmente interessante, dato che il libro biblico in questione è tra quelli che meno si prestano alla predicazione cristiana.

La composizione del commentario è quella tradizionale, quale viene del resto suggerita dal libro biblico stesso. Dopo un'introduzione, abbiamo una prima parte comprendente i cc. 1-12 (suddivisi in cc. 1-6 e 7-12), una seconda parte comprendente i cc. 13-21 (suddivisi in cc. 13-19 e 20-21) ed infine i cc. 22-24. L'orientamento del volume fa sì che non ci si possano attendere discussioni dettagliate in campo topografico e storico-tradizionale. D'altra parte, temi d'introduzione non appaiono assenti dall'opera: l'autore non esita infatti a confrontarsi coi problemi connessi con le antiche traduzioni, specialmente LXX^B e LXX^A (p. 13 ss.).

Altri due elementi si impongono immediatamente all'attenzione del lettore: in primo luogo l'autore tende a fare un uso soltanto limitato dell'ipotesi di un'opera storiografica deuteronomistica, o almeno a non trarre le logiche conseguenze da un'ipotesi del genere; in secondo luogo la traduzione del testo ebraico in olandese, per la quale l'autore sviluppa un proprio metodo.

Per il primo dei due (p. 11 ss.) il Beek sostiene, in discussione in parte col mio commentario apparso nel 1970, che non è necessario ammettere la redazione finale del libro durante o poco dopo l'esilio babilonese, elemento implicito nell'inserimento dell'opera nella storiografia dtr.: almeno la redazione dei cc. 1-12 dev'essere avvenuta molto prima. Ritengo tuttavia che il problema vada impostato diversamente: una redazione tardiva può benissimo includere materiali molto più antichi, nel nostro caso, anzi, là dove non è possibile dimostrare che il Dtr. abbia composto per proprio uso e consumo, una tale possibilità diventa una probabilità. In altre parole, accade un po' come se oggi componiamo un'antologia di una qualsiasi letteratura: la scelta e la redazione dei materiali sono certamente moderne e quindi recenti, ma i materiali scelti sono in buona parte molto più antichi. Così nei cc. 1-12 almeno due testi: il c. 1 ed il c. 8,30-35, non possono essere di molto anteriori all'esilio, anzi, sono probabilmente esilici o post-esilici antichi. Diversa è certamente la situazione dei cc. 13-22, dove possono esservi ricordi di antiche frontiere e di antichi confini tribali. D'altra parte, proprio qui l'autore si mostra piuttosto critico nei confronti delle tesi di A. Alt (p. 175 ss.): «Dobbiamo constatare che interessi teorici contraddicono la realtà storica» (p. 176); ma resta poco chiaro quale è l'alternativa che l'autore propone alle tesi dell'Alt.

Il secondo elemento è quello delle traduzioni dall'ebraico, con la problematica proposta dalla cosiddetta «scuola di Amsterdam», sorta intorno all'Università cittadina (per tale «scuola» cfr. recentemente N. A. van Uchelen, «Bijbeluitleg volgens de 'Amsterdamse school'», *GerTT* 79, 1979, pp. 201-214). «Ho dovuto attenermi al testo ebraico, scrive l'autore (p. 15 s.),

e far sì ch'esso giungesse alla sua piena espressione, sebbene il risultato suoni qua e là alquanto goffo (*wat houterig*)». Questo desiderio di consentire all'originale di esprimersi nella lingua d'arrivo in maniera piena e completa ha ispirato la traduzione tedesca di M. Buber e F. Rosenzweig, e ne è nata una traduzione che è un capolavoro; è stato seguito anche da A. Chouraqui in francese, ma ha dato luogo, come del resto nel nostro caso, a rese pesanti e goffe. Per cui il problema sembra spostarsi dal metodo al carisma del traduttore. Se dunque a 1,1 leggiamo (p. 35): «Yhwh disse a Mosè... dicendo», e così altre volte in vari punti del commentario (col brutto participio usato in forma gerundiva *zeggende*, che il carattere tradizionale non rende né migliore né più efficace), possiamo sinceramente affermare che abbiamo aiutato l'ebraico ad esprimersi in maniera più autentica? Non obblighiamo piuttosto la lingua d'arrivo a far propria una forma le cui funzioni sono sostanzialmente diverse da quelle della lingua di partenza? «Chi traduce un testo letteralmente è un bugiardo — chi lo modifica è un traditore e un eretico», affermava, sia pure in un contesto molto differente, R. Jehuda, Bab. *Qidd.* 49a!

Per il resto il commentario segue il testo. Efficaci sono le sue spiegazioni, cfr. per es. a 1,11 sui «tre giorni» o a 3,14-16 sulle teorie razionalistiche (terremoto!) del fenomeno descritto in 3,14-16. Nell'esame dei testi topografici manca invece, là dove le località indicate possono essere identificate con *tell* o località moderni, la presentazione delle coordinate sulle carte del *Survey of Israel*, prima *Survey of Palestine*; ciò non facilita certo uno studio organico della topografia dei passi in questione.

Le conclusioni omiletiche alla fine di ogni sezione sono efficaci, e cercano, senza mai cadere nell'allegoria, di trarre il massimo dall'aridità del testo. Alla fine dell'opera due brevi *excursus* informano il lettore sul problema dei testi di alleanza e su quello dell'assemblea di Sichem (p. 214 ss.).

Un buon commentario dunque, elegantemente presentato, che renderà servizio non solo al predicatore e al catechista, ma anche al biblista e all'orientalista.

Via Pietro Cossa, 42
00193 Roma

J. A. SOGGIN

A. HURVITZ, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel. A New Approach to an Old Problem* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique, 20) XVIII-198 S. Paris 1982. J. Gabalda et C^{ie}.

Der Verf. hat sich seit 1963 in vielen Beiträgen (vgl. S. 7, Anm. 1, und die Bibliographie) als Fachmann auf dem Gebiet des Late Biblical Hebrew ausgewiesen. Auf Grund seiner Vertrautheit mit dem mischnischen und dem modernen Hebräisch bringt er günstige Voraussetzungen mit für die Behandlung eines "old problem", dessen sich heute vor allem israelische Gelehrte annehmen. Das vorliegende Buch kann in bibliographischer Hinsicht zugleich

als Hinführung zu diesem Fragenkreis dienen. Man vergleiche in der Bibliographie (S. XI-XVI) namentlich die Arbeiten von Bendavid, Grintz, Haran, Japhet, Komlosch, Kutscher, Levine, Milgrom, Rabin und D. Strauss. Weitere Beiträge wie die von Qimron und Hannemann sind über das Autorenregister auffindbar. In einem Postscriptum (Anhang 3, S. 171) wird auf eine Studie von Guenther und einen Rezensionenartikel von Rendsburg hingewiesen. Mit einer 1976 erschienen Untersuchung von Polzin (Late Biblical Hebrew) konnte sich der Verf. besonders in Anhang 2 (S. 163-179) auseinandersetzen.

Das zentrale Anliegen, das der Verf. unbeirrt verfolgt, ist der Nachweis, daß die Sprache des Ez-Buches dem Späthebräischen näher steht als die von P, wo keine Abweichungen vom klassischen Hebräisch zu erkennen seien. Sieht man von dem Urteil über den absoluten Ort der Sprache von P einmal ab (nach Polzin steht P zwischen der klassischen Sprache und dem Späthebräischen) und betrachtet man nur das Verhältnis zwischen P und Ez, so dürfte das Ergebnis des Verf. unanfechtbar sein. Die Forschung ist ihm zu Dank verpflichtet, daß er das sprachliche Gefälle ansichtig gemacht hat. Wenn es um die Sprache des Ez-Buches geht, werden Einleitungen und Kommentare die vorliegende Studie auswerten müssen. Hoffentlich stehen die chronologischen Auffassungen des Verf. (P soll vorexilisch sein) der Rezeption nicht im Wege.

Die Beobachtungen des Verf. sind grammatikalischer und lexikalischer Art. Jeder Interessierte kann sie in dem zentralen Kap. II (S. 23-141) — der Rest ist methodische Absicherung und chronologische Auswertung — selbst bei eiliger Konsultation leicht auffinden. Niemand wird etwas dagegen einwenden, daß in einem Exkurs (S. 119-141) auch Beobachtungen zu dem sprachlichen Gefälle zwischen Dtn und Königsbüchern einerseits und dem Ez-Buch andererseits beigelegt werden. Wort-, Stellen-, Sach- und Autorenregister (S. 173-196) erleichtern die Konsultation.

Einige Anmerkungen zu den sprachlichen Beobachtungen: Die Form *sûsôtâm* ist gegenüber *sûsôtejhâm* zweifellos älterer Sprachgebrauch im zeitlichen Rahmen der alttestamentlichen Literatur (S. 24-26). Weniger sicher und für die Argumentation des Verf. auch nicht erforderlich ist die absolute grammatikalische Priorität von *sûsôtâm*. — Zum Gebrauch von *š'tajim* 'ammôt bei Ez (gegenüber dem Dual 'ammatajim bei P) (S. 30-32) verdient erwähnt zu werden, daß die Ez-Stellen neben der Zahl "zwei" immer auch andere Zahlen (drei, vier, sechs, sieben oder acht) anführen. Das kann den ausdrücklichen Gebrauch von "zwei" bedingt haben. Die P-Stellen bringen andere Größen außer 'ammatajim entweder gar nicht oder nur in Form von 'ammatajim (bzw. 'ammah) wāḥeš. — Bei der Form *w^hitqaddištî* (sic) in Ez 38,23 (S. 39-43) kann die Nähe von *w^hitgaddiltî* (sic) (*gdl* kennt kein Nifal) von Einfluß gewesen sein. — Der Ausdruck *l'dorotejkām* usw. (S. 98-101) fehlt in den Ez-Stellen vielleicht deshalb, weil sie nicht wie P aus der fiktiven Situation der Mose-Zeit über Jahrhunderte hinweg Gesetze erlassen.

Nachdem wir das zentrale Anliegen des Verf. und die darauf abzielenden Beobachtungen nachdrücklich anerkannt haben, muß leider dagegen protestiert werden, daß alles in den Dienst einer verkehrten Sache gestellt wird, nämlich der Frühdatierung von P. Verständlich ist die Schlußfolgerung schon. Wenn ein sprachliches Gefälle von P nach Ez in Richtung des Späthebräi-

schen (Chronikbücher, Esra, Nehemia, Daniel, Ester u.a.) und Mischnischen besteht und die Ez-Stellen von dem Exilspropheten stammen, ist mit vorexilischer Entstehungszeit von P zu rechnen, zumal P nach Ansicht des Verf. nicht vom Standard des klassischen Hebräisch abweicht. In diesem Sinne hat sich der Verf. namentlich schon in *RB* 81 (1974) 24-56 geäußert. Er steht damit in einer breiteren Forschungsrichtung unserer Zeit (vgl. zuletzt Z. Zevit, "Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P", *ZAW* 94 [1982] 481-511). Als ältere Befürworter der Frühdatierung erscheinen in der Bibliographie z. B. D. Hoffmann und Boyd.

Zur Datierungsfrage folgende kritische Erwägungen: 1) Sprachliche Befunde können meist nur im Rahmen einer umfassenden historisch-kritischen Argumentation in Chronologie umgesetzt werden. Wie will ich auf rein sprachlicher Basis entscheiden, ob Kohelet vor oder nach Sirach anzusetzen ist? *In rigore* kann P trotz seiner älteren Sprache recht gut nach Ez entstanden sein. Wenn es dem Verf. nur um sprachliche Beobachtungen auf der geräumigen Skala zwischen dem klassischen Bibelhebräisch und dem Mischnischen zu tun war, hätte er es bei der Feststellung belassen sollen, daß das Ez-Buch *sprachlich* jünger ist als P. Es wirkt zwiespältig, wenn die äußerst wichtige historisch-kritische Gesamtargumentation betont ausgeklammert und gleichzeitig massiv die Frühdatierung von P suggeriert wird. 2) Zu den selbstverständlichen Voraussetzungen des Verf. zählt offenbar, daß das Ez-Buch in der ersten Hälfte des 6. Jahrhunderts entstanden ist und im wesentlichen oder zu einem beträchtlichen Teil auf Ezechiel selbst zurückgeht. Er weiß zwar um die Möglichkeit, daß das Ez-Buch als pseudepigraphische Schrift relativ spät entstanden sein könnte (vgl. die Relativierungen S. 151-153 und S. 161; L. Zunz wird oft zitiert), zeigt sich aber nicht weiter davon beeindruckt und nimmt lieber vorexilischen Ursprung von P in Kauf. Richtiger ist m. E. folgende Sicht der Dinge: P ist aus den verschiedensten Gründen, auch sprachlicher Art, nicht vorexilisch; wenn nun das Ez-Buch sprachlich noch jünger ist, wird es wohl nicht authentisch sein. Den Befürwortern der pseudepigraphischen Lösung, zu denen sich der Rez. zählt (vgl. "Erwägungen zur ezechielschen Frage", in: *Künder des Wortes*, Festschrift J. Schreiner [Würzburg 1982] 137-149), wird somit eines ihrer Argumente vom Verf. in verbesserter Form nachgeliefert. 3) Die chronologischen Vorstellungen des Verf. kommen vollends in Bedrängnis, wenn die klassische Sprache, auf die dann die ezechielsche, die späthebräische und die mischnische folgen, gar nicht (ausschließlich) vorexilisch ist. Dabei braucht man nicht einmal die radikale These einer wachsenden Zahl von Forschern zu teilen, die J, E, D und Dtr samt und sonders für nachexilisch halten, was mit bezug auf D und Dtr zuzutreffen scheint. Es genügt die Tatsache, daß es Texte dtr Prägung und redaktionelle Partien der Prophetenbücher gibt, die sicher nachexilisch sind und gleichwohl im Rahmen der klassischen Sprache bleiben. 4) Man wird dem Verf. mit Sicherheit ankreiden, daß er sowohl bei P als auch bei Ez von Schichtungen und erst recht von Textverbesserungen absieht (vgl. z. B. S. 19-21, 153 und 162, Anm. 19). Der Rez. vermag in diesem bewußten Vorgehen keinen methodischen Mangel zu sehen, weil sich ihm jedenfalls Ez als ein einheitliches Werk darstellt. Eine kursorische Prüfung, die *ad hominem* von landläufiger literarkritischer Scheidung ausging, ergab denn auch, daß die sprachlichen

Beobachtungen des Verf. in der Tat nicht schichtenspezifisch sind. Die kleine Übung deckte einige verborgene Falten der sprachlichen Einheitlichkeit des Ez-Buches auf.

Corrigenda: S. 43, Z. 2: XXXVIII, 23; S. 97, Anm. 135, Z. 4: *qwm*; S. XII: Die 1. Aufl. der *Introduction* von S. R. Driver stammt aus dem Jahre 1891; S. XVI: Es wäre wissenswert, daß Zunz, *Vorträge*, in 1. Aufl. schon 1832 erschienen ist.

Pater Damiaanstraat 38
6369 SV Simpelveld
Niederlande

Joachim BECKER

Novum Testamentum

Ceslas SPICQ, O.P., *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire. Supplément* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 22/3). 698 p. 22,5 × 15,5. Fribourg, Suisse: Éditions Universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1982.

As a follow-up on his massive two-volume *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire* published in 1978 (cf. *Bib* 61 [1980] 440-442) C. Spicq presents a "Supplément" in which he discusses more than 125 Greek words. The mention of "Notes" in the title is important: the essays are not meant to be complete studies but suggestions for the never-ending task of coming as close as possible to the meaning and significance of Scripture. The following notes on Spicq's *Notes* are offered in the same spirit.

P. 63: In commenting on the word *apostolos* found at Heb 3,1 Spicq thinks in terms of the Johannine Jesus "sent" by God (cf. John 9,7). Whether the author of Hebrews has been influenced by the Johannine tradition, as Spicq thinks, is debatable, but the basic meaning seems justified. Support for it can be sought in the following verse (Heb 3,2) which contains the idea of designation by God (*piston onta tō poiēsanti auton*).

P. 126: The bibliographical listings with regard to the meaning of *dikaïos* as Mt 1,19 (cf. note 4) should include D. Hill, "A Note on Matthew i. 19", *ExpTim* 76 (1965) 133-34.

P. 147: The use of the word *dikaiōmata* at Rev 19,8 is interpreted by Spicq (note 1) as a proof of the virtue of the faithful based on the meaning "pièce justificative" of contemporary Greek terminology. But then Spicq seems reluctant to apply this same meaning to Rev 15,4 (cf. pp. 147-148) where it would seem appropriate if applied analogously to God (the presence of the word *hosios* in 15,4 seems to match the presence of *hagiōn* in 19,8).

Pp. 189-190: The discussion of *eggyos*, "guarantor", in Heb 7,22 is particularly felicitous. Perhaps it would not be out of place to point out an

implication of the term in Hebrews. Jesus as “guarantor” of a “better” *diathēkē* is commensurate with his charge because of the oath of God assuring the beneficiaries of the *diathēkē* that Jesus will remain eternally priest (cf. 7.20-21.23-24). This implies that the *diathēkē* is equally definitive and abiding (noted by Spicq, p. 189). Spicq speaks about the guarantor guaranteeing the reception of the benefits promised by the *diathēkē* (p. 190). True. But it would seem even more immediately relevant to view him as being guarantor of the *diathēkē* itself. And this in turn would seem to indicate a significant difference between the word *eggyos* and *mesitēs*, a difference which Spicq seems to minimize (cf. p. 189, n. 4).

P. 294: Spicq concludes that the word *epiousios* in the “Our Father” can mean either “the bread of tomorrow” (“le pain de demain”) or “the bread which is indispensable” (“le pain qui est nécessaire”). Given the midrashic technique of drawing various meanings out of words, it may well be possible to view both meanings as legitimate at one and the same time. If the nearly unanimous opinion of the Fathers is correct that the phrase contains an allusion to the eucharist, the double meaning is both appropriate and striking in view of the placing of the “Our Father” in the gospels before the institution of the eucharist.

Pp. 424-425: In his discussion of the title *kyrios* with regard to Christ Spicq does well to link it explicitly with Jesus’ royal and messianic prerogatives, with no mention of the “Son of man” title. Confusion of the latter title with Jesus’ royal titles is one of the main reasons why “Son of man” remains an enigma in New Testament studies.

P. 453: Spicq gives the following interpretation of the etymology of *metanoō*: “De même que *pronoein* signifie ‘connaître avant, prévoir’, *metanoēin* est littéralement ‘connaître après’; la particule *meta* indiquant la proximité ou la concomitance”. He cites Clement of Alexandria in support of his view, but Clement seems to be giving a folk etymology for the purpose of edification. Be that as it may, it would seem more plausible to view the *meta* of *metanoō* as indicating “change”, as in *metabainō*, *metamelomai*, and *metamorphoomai*.

Pp. 526-533: The discussion of the word *parrhēsia* must now be compared with S. Marrow, “*Parrhēsia* and the New Testament”, *CBQ* 44 (1982) 431-446. Marrow’s treatment is superior: more detailed bibliographical listings of both primary and secondary sources, better organization of the material, greater insight into the New Testament texts. To be sure, Marrow’s article is almost twice as long, but the difference is not just in quantity but in the whole approach. Here is a specific example of the importance of taking the word “notes” in Spicq’s title seriously.

P. 586: With regard to the word *proslambanomai* in Mt 16.22 Spicq notes that the customary meaning “tirant à lui” or “prenant à partie” have no other attestations. He suggests that the word be taken in the sense of “prendre de force, s’emparer, maîtriser”. The suggestion has merit. To the reviewer it makes better sense in the context, as Spicq observes.

P. 393: Spicq at his best can put things well: “. . . normalement la *kauchēsis* est la fierté proprement dite, qui n’est ni de la vanité ou de l’arrogance, ni un simple contentement ou de la satisfaction, mais plutôt de l’hon-

neur, un sentiment de dignité et de noblesse, dont l'Apôtre donne la nuance exacte: 'J'ai donc cette fierté dans le Christ Jésus pour le service de Dieu' (*Rom.* xv, 17). Cette exaltation et cette joie ne sont légitimes que 'dans le Christ' et même 'au service' de Dieu, par la prédication de l'Evangile; ce sont celles d'un serviteur consciencieux et fidèle, mais qui a des sentiments élevés". For those who, like the reviewer, find the anti-Triumphalism of the post-Vatican II era a bit too simplistic, these words provide a rallying character.

Meaning and significance.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

James SWETNAM, S.J.

Robert M. FOWLER, *Loaves and Fishes. The Function of the Feeding Stories in the Gospel of Mark* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 54). 258 S. Chico, California 1981. Scholars Press.

Die Dissertation von der University of Chicago (1978) fragt nach der Herkunft und der literarischen Funktion der beiden Speisungsgeschichten in Markus. Im 1.Kap. werden verschiedene Theorien zurückgewiesen, die eine vormarkinische Wundersammlung annehmen und die Präsenz der beiden Speisungen durch die Aufnahme von zwei Traditionsstücken erklären. Das 2.Kap. widmet sich der Scheidung von Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 8,1-10 und 6,30-44. F. stellt die These auf, daß 8,1-10 im wesentlichen von der Tradition her vorlag und daß Markus selber auf der Basis dieser Tradition den Abschnitt 6,30-44 komponiert hat. Im 3.Kap. geht F. der literarischen Funktion der beiden Geschichten im Kontext nach. Er vergleicht ihre Beziehung mit derjenigen der beiden See- (4,35-41; 6,45-52) und der beiden Heilungsgeschichten (7,31-37; 8,22-26), untersucht den Zusammenhang von 6,30-44 mit 6,6b-29 und die Beziehung zu den anderen Mahlerzählungen bei Markus. Das 4.Kap. befaßt sich ganz allgemein mit der Autor-Leser-Beziehung bei Markus und bringt einen Katalog der literarischen Mittel und der Stellen, durch die der Autor in eindeutiger und verlässlicher Weise dem Leser zeigt, wie er verstanden sein möchte. — Die Arbeit ist interessant und temperamentvoll geschrieben und vermittelt viele wertvolle Einsichten. Man würde ihr aber mehr inneren Zusammenhang wünschen; teilweise wirkt sie eher wie eine Materialsammlung. Sehr gut formuliert und überzeugend sind die Grundsätze, in denen der oft enge Horizont der Exegese ausgeweitet und verlangt wird, daß der Evangelist als Autor und das Evangelium als literarisches Werk und Sinnganzes ernstgenommen werden (39-42). In einer etwas störenden Weise ist die Untersuchung von 6,30-44 so dargestellt, daß ihr Ergebnis, die Abhängigkeit von 8,1-10, immer schon vorweggenommen wird (68-90), statt daß sie als Schlußfolgerung am Ende stünde. Die These von 6,30-44 als einer

redaktionellen Komposition muß sich erst noch bewähren. Das Bemühen um die literarische Funktion und Beziehung der beiden Speisungsgeschichten fällt überraschend kurz aus (91-99). Entsprechend schmal ist das Ergebnis: Markus hat 6,30-44 als Hintergrund für 8,1-10 geschaffen, um aus der Frage der Jünger in 8,4 ein "Zeichen ihrer unglaublichen Blindheit und Dummheit" (93), eine "Selbstverurteilung" (99) der Jünger zu machen. Es ist sicher richtig, daß das Unverständnis der Jünger bei Markus und speziell in den Speisungsgeschichten eine besondere Rolle spielt und daß die Frage von 8,4 auf dem Hintergrund von 6,30-44 erst ihre ganze Virulenz bekommt. Es sollten aber die beiden Geschichten auf *alle* ihre Aussagen und inhaltlichen Beziehungen hin untersucht werden, bevor ein Urteil über ihre Funktion gefällt wird. Zu den interessantesten Teilen des Buches gehört der Abschnitt über die 'Dublekten' (100-114); er enthält treffende Beobachtungen aus literarischer Sicht. Ein Problem, dem sich keine Exegese von Markus entziehen kann, ist die starke Betonung des Unverständnisses und des Versagens der Jünger. Bei der Interpretation sollten aber alle Textaussagen berücksichtigt werden und es sollte die Spannung und Dramatik, die im Evangelium enthalten ist, nicht zerstört werden. F. scheint die Tendenz zu haben, das Bild der Jünger in forcierten Auslegungen noch dunkler zu machen und alle positiven Hinweise auszuklammern. Aus der Tatsache, daß in 2,18.24; 7,1-8 die Jünger sich gegen pharisäische Normen verfehlen, daß aber Jesus ihr Verhalten rechtfertigt, wird geschlossen, daß sie selber zu einer solchen Rechtfertigung nicht fähig sind und nicht wissen, was sie tun (133). In die Frage der Jünger von 6,37 wird die Weigerung hineingelesen, für die Menge 200 Denare auszugeben. Aus der Anweisung für die Mission, kein Brot und kein Geld mitzunehmen (6,8), wird ein absoluter Maßstab gemacht. Dementsprechend wird die Tatsache, daß die Jünger nach 6,37f wohl Geld und einige Brote haben, als Skandal bezeichnet und es wird daraus geschlossen, daß ihre Aussendung völlig fehlgeschlagen ist (116-119). Es ist wohl textgemäßer, die positiven Aussagen von 6,12f.30f als positive zu respektieren und sie nicht wegzunutzen. Daß die Jünger 5 Brote und 2 Fische haben, wird in 6,38.41 nicht als Skandal dargestellt. Es ist auch nicht die Behauptung einzusehen: "Das Herz von 6,30-44 ist die Auseinandersetzung über Brot und Geld zwischen Jesus und den Zwölf (6,36-38)" (117). Die Tendenz des Markus die Jünger anzuschwärzen soll so weit gehen, daß er als erster einen Jünger Jesu zum Verräter Jesu gemacht hat. Dies wird zunächst als Möglichkeit geäußert (136), wird dann aber gleich als unausweichlicher Zwang für die ganze Tradition und alle anderen Evangelisten erklärt (137). F. sieht zurecht einen Zusammenhang zwischen den beiden Heilungsgeschichten in 7,31-37; 8,22-26 und dem Tadel der Jünger in 8,17-21 (105-112). Ihre Interpretation als Hinweis, Jesus könne anderen, aber nicht seinen Jüngern Hören und Sehen verleihen, ist zumindest nicht selbstverständlich. Ihre Interpretation als Zeichen, daß die Jünger auf die unmittelbare Hilfe Jesu angewiesen sind, sollte wenigstens erwogen werden. Es fällt auf — zumal in einer Studie, die sich mit den literarischen Zusammenhängen befaßt —, daß 8,27-30 in der Auslegung von 8,1-26 nicht einmal erwähnt wird, obwohl es zum unmittelbaren Kontext gehört. Im 4. Kap. wird kurz genannt, welche Elemente in 8,27 – 9,1 erstmals auftauchen (173-175). Aber auch da wird nicht erwähnt, daß Jesus hier erstmals direkt

nach seiner Identität fragt und daß ihn Petrus als den Christus bekennt. In 8,17-21 hat Jesus den Jüngern nur Vorwürfe wegen ihres Unverständnisses gemacht; in 8,27-29 sagt er ihnen, was er von ihnen wissen will. Die Antwort des Petrus ist ein Zielpunkt; die Bemerkungen über das Unverständnis der Jünger hören von hier ab auf. Sie ist aber kein Endpunkt, wie 8,31-33 zeigt. Die Spannung und das Ringen beginnen von neuem. Die Jünger müssen lernen und sich zu eigen machen, daß Jesus der gekreuzigte Christus ist. Bei der Auslegung von 14,18-31 wird 14,27 überhaupt nicht berücksichtigt und 14,28 nur in der Weise, daß es als unsicher und zweideutig abgewertet wird (135f. cf. 175). Erst in der letzten Fußnote wird es als möglich eingeräumt, daß 16,7 (cf. 14,28) die Zukunft der Jünger offen hält (233). Sonst wird das totale und endgültige Versagen der Jünger als das letzte Wort hingestellt. 14,27 gibt aber wohl zu verstehen, daß es notwendig zu diesem Versagen kommt: Die Schafe für sich können nicht standhalten; sie sind auf den Hirten angewiesen. 14,28 drückt den Ruf und die Einladung an die Jünger aus, dem Auferstandenen von neuem zu folgen. Das Bild, das Markus von den Jüngern zeichnet, muß mit allen seinen Farben und Formen berücksichtigt werden. Es wirkt wie eine Illustration zur Feststellung des Paulus: Alle haben gesündigt. Keiner ist aus sich selber gerecht (cf. Röm 3). Es zeigt auch, wie es in der Beziehung zu Jesus keinen sicheren Besitz und kein Ausruhen gibt, wie der Jünger Jesu immer neu und immer weiter auf den Weg der Nachfolge gerufen ist. Zu den Fragen ohne Antwort (167) gehört auch 12,35.37.

Tschurtschenthalerstr. 7
A-6020 Innsbruck

Klemens STOCK

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Dennis J. McCarthy, S.J. (1924-1983): In Memoriam

One of the well known professors of the Old Testament at the Biblical Institute died of a heart attack during his sleep early in the morning of August 29 at Salamanca, Spain. On Saturday, August 27, he had read a paper, "Hero and Anti-Hero in I Samuel 13:2-14:6" for the first international meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature held in conjunction with the XI Congress of the Organization for the Study of the Old Testament.

Father McCarthy was born October 24, 1924 and grew up in Chicago and Milwaukee or, as he would say, "in the Middlewest" of the United States. On August 8, 1944 he entered the Society of Jesus at the novitiate near Florissant, Missouri, and was ordained a priest on June 20, 1956.

His Scripture and Near Eastern Studies were done in Rome, in Berlin, with Professor Johannes Friedrich, and in Paris with Professors Jean Nougayrol and Henri Cazelles. The latter directed his dissertation which was to become the great contribution, *Treaty and Covenant*. He first taught at the Jesuit theologate in St. Marys, Kansas, then at St. Louis University, and since 1969 at the Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Best known for his work on Covenant, Father McCarthy did not limit his interest to that field. Author of numerous articles, scholarly and popular, he was contentedly working during the last years of his life on a commentary on the Books of Samuel for the *Hermeneia* series. He was particularly interested in Hebrew prose style and the nature of narrative forms.

As Old Testament editor of *Biblica*, Father McCarthy would not only perform the normal tasks of editor but would share his vast learning and insights with authors, generously helping to improve the proposed article. It was this generosity with his time and scholarship that made him an outstanding director of dissertations. He demanded excellent work and was willing to show in detail how it could be achieved.

He was a man of many parts, vastly learned in a number of areas: music, especially opera, Baroque art, English literature and the schools of literary criticism, Dante (he had prepared his own annotated edition), and the American Civil War. Through the years he guided hundreds of pilgrims through Rome on what can surely be rated as among the most learned and interesting tours ever conducted.

He was a man of strong opinions and could express himself strongly, something which did not settle well with everyone. He was a hemophiliac

and all through his life suffered much pain, but his delight in ideas and learning, his pleasure in his work enabled him to accomplish much despite the many handicaps.

He was also a man of strong faith and every year read the entire Bible through for his own devotion. One of his favorite themes for lectures on the Scriptures was the holiness of God. His life seems to be a fulfillment of the exhortation of St Paul: "Fill your mind with everything that is true, everything that is noble, everything that is good and pure, everything we love and honor, and everything that can be thought virtuous or worthy of praise".

The Biblical Institute will feel keenly the absence of his learning and scholarship, but it is even more as a well loved friend that he will be missed so very much.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

John WELCH S.J.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

All books and fascicles in anyway connected with the biblical field sent to *Biblica* are listed here. No judgment about the book is implied by the fact of its being listed.

Further mention of the book in *Biblica* depends on the Book Review Editor's judgment. Inclusion of a book in this list neither guarantees nor precludes subsequent review.

Articles sent to *Biblica*, as well as all books and fascicles of books, are made available to the editor of the *Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus* published by the Pontifical Biblical Institute. The editor of the *Elenchus* may include them or not include them in his listings as he sees fit.

All material destined for review is to be sent to: Directio *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, 00187 Roma, Italy.

Vetus Testamentum

Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament. The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism* (The Oxford Bible Series). ix-172 p. 19,8 × 13. Oxford - New York 1983. Oxford University Press. £3.50.

Butler, Trent C., *Joshua* (Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 7). XLII-304 p. 25,5 × 15,8. Waco, Texas 1983. Word Books, Publisher.

Chilton, Bruce D., *The Glory of Israel. The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOT Supplement Series 23). ix-178 p. 21,6 × 13,5. Sheffield 1983. Department of Biblical Studies. £11.50.

Coppens, Joseph, *Le fils d'homme vétéro- et intertestamentaire. La relève apocalyptique du messianisme royal II*. (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium LXI). xvii-272 p. 24,3 × 18. Leuven 1983. Uitgeverij Peeters - University Press. FB 1.000.

Benjamin, Don C., *Deuteronomy and City Life. A Form Criticism of Texts with the Word CITY (ʿir) in Deuteronomy 4:41-26:19*. xiii-351 p. 21,2 × 13,7. Lanham - London 1983. University Press of America. US \$14.00.

De Vries, Simon J., *The Achievements of Biblical Religion. A Prolegomenon to Old Testament Theology*. xxxviii-518 p. 21,2 × 13,7. Lanham - New York - London 1983. University Press of America. US \$19.75.

Goulder, Michael D., *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah* (JSOT Supplement Series 20). xiv-302 p. 21,1 × 13,6. Sheffield 1983. Department of Biblical Studies. £8.95.

Greenberg, Moshe, *Ezekiel 1-20. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 22). xv-388 p. 23,8 × 15,8. Garden City, N.Y. 1983. Doubleday & Company, Inc. US \$16.00.

Greenspoon, Leonard J., *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 28). xiii-397 p. 22,3 × 14,3. Chico, CA 1983. Scholars Press. US \$21.75.

The Holy Bible. The Book of Proverbs. Annotated Critical Translation from the Original Languages by The Studium Biblicum Franciscanum. 237 p. 20,7 × 15,4. Tokyo 1983. Chuo Shuppansha. [Japanese].

Jagersma, H., *Numeri. Deel I* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament). 280 p. 23 × 15. Nijkerk 1983. Callenbach. Fl. 75,00.

Jean Chrysostome, *Commentaire sur Isaïe*. Introduction, texte critique et notes par Jean **Dumortier**. Traduction par Arthur **Liefooghe** (Sources Chrétiennes 304). 396 p. 19,5 × 12,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 331.

Kornfeld, Walter, *Levitikus* (Die Neue Echter Bibel, Lieferung 6). 113 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Würzburg 1983. Echter. DM 28,-.

Magaß, Walter, *Hermeneutik und Semiotik*. Schrift – Predigt – Emblematis (Forum Theologiae Linguisticae 15). 108 p. 22,8 × 15. Bonn 1983. Linguistica Biblica. DM 15.

Malamat, Abraham, *Israel in Biblical Times. Historical Essays*. 20-336 p. 23 × 15,4. Jerusalem 1983. The Bialik Institute and The Israel Exploration Society. [Hebrew].

Miscall, Peter D., *The Workings of Old Testament Narrative* (SBL, Semeia Studies). 150 p. 21,5 × 14. Philadelphia, PE – Chico, CA, 1983. Fortress Press – Scholars Press. US \$8.95.

Moberly, R. W. L., *At the Mountain of God. Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34*. (JSOT Supplement Series 22). 258 p. 21,6 × 13,5. Sheffield 1983. Department of Biblical Studies. £8.95.

Mora, Vincent, *Le signe de Jonas* (Lire la Bible 63). 147 p. 18 × 11,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 58,50.

Origène, *Philocalie, 1-20 sur les Ecritures*. Introduction, texte, traduction et notes par Marguerite **Harl**. *La lettre à Africanus sur l'histoire de Suzanne*. Introduction, texte, traduction et notes par Nicholas **De Lange** (Sources Chrétiennes 302). 606 p. 19,5 × 12,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 445.

Perez Castro, F., *El Códice de Profetas de El Cairo. Tomo II, Samuel*. Edición de su Texto y Masoras [con colaboradores]. (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 30). 308 p. 28 × 19. Madrid 1983. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. Instituto «Arias Montano». Ptas. 3000.

Peters, Melvin K. H., (Ed.), *A Critical Edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch*. Volume 5, Deuteronomy (SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 15). XII-114 p. 21,5 × 13,6. Chico, CA, 1983. Scholars Press. US \$11.95.

Schäfer-Lichtenberger, Christa, *Stadt und Eidgenossenschaft im Alten Testament*. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Max Webers Studie "Das antike Judentum" (BZAW 156). XI-485 p. 23,5 × 15,8. Berlin - New York 1983. Walter de Gruyter. DM 108.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament (Hrsg. G. Johannes **Botterweck**, Helmer **Ringgren**, und Heinz-Josef **Fabry**), Band IV, Lieferung 5 (Spalte 513-640). 25,5 × 17,8. Stuttgart 1983. Kohlhammer.

Vetus Latina, Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel. Nach **Petrus Sabatier** neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der **Erzabtei Beuron**, 11/1. Sapientia Salomonis. Herausgegeben von Walter **Thiele**. 6. Lieferung. Sap. 8,8-13,1 p. 401-480. 24 × 31,7. Freiburg 1983. Herder.

Novum Testamentum

Bailey, Kenneth E., *Poet & Peasant and Through Peasant Eyes*. A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables of Luke. 187 p. 22,6 × 15,1. Grand Rapids, MI, 1983. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. \$8.85.

Barrett, Charles K., *Il vangelo di Giovanni fra simbolismo e storia*. Traduzione di Bruno Corsani (Brevi studi 4). 91 p. 20 × 13. Torino 1983. Claudiana. Lit. 4.500.

Bauckham, Richard J., *Jude, 2 Peter* (Word Biblical Commentary 50). XIX-357 p. 23,5 × 17,5. Waco, Texas, 1983. Word Books, Publisher. US \$18.95.

Bonnard, Pierre, *Les Epîtres Johanniques* (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament XIIIc) 146 p. 23,5 × 17,6. Genève 1983. Labor et Fides.

Bruce, F. F., *1 & 2 Thessalonians* (Word Biblical Commentary 45). XLVII-228 p. 23,5 × 17,5. Waco, Texas, 1983. Word Books, Publisher.

Frankemölle, Hubert, *Biblische Handlungsanweisungen*. Beispiele Pragmatischer Exegese. 248 p. 22 × 14. Mainz 1983. Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag.

Frankemölle, Hubert, *Friede und Schwert*. Frieden Schaffen nach dem Neuen Testament. 172 p. 20,5 × 13,5. Mainz 1983. Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag.

Gottiaux, Jean, *La sacralisation du mariage*. De la Genèse aux incises matthéennes. Contribution à une théologie du développement dogmatique, à l'histoire de la discipline des mœurs, et aux problèmes posés par l'absolue indissolubilité du mariage chrétien. 793 p. 24,7 × 16,3. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 125.

Fusco, Vittorio, *Oltre la parabola*. Introduzione alle parabole di Gesù (Collana di Cristologia). 202 p. 21 × 12,5. Roma 1983. Borla. Lit. 10.000.

Gerleman, G., *Der Menschensohn* (Studia Biblica I). 79 p. 24 × 16. Leiden 1983. E. J. Brill. Fl. 33.

Ghiberti, Giuseppe, *La rizzurrezione di Gesù* (Quaderni del Centro di Studi Biblici di Sacile I). 193 p. 21 × 13,8. Brescia 1983. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 10.000.

Kelber, W. H., *The Oral and the Written Gospel*. The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q. xviii-254 p. 23,5 × 15,7. Philadelphia, PA, 1983. Fortress Press. US \$22.95.

Lüdemann, Gerd, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel*. Band I, Studien zur Chronologie. 301 p. Band II, Antipaulinismus im frühen Christentum. 322 p. 23,7 × 16,2. Göttingen 1983. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. DM 66.00. DM. 82.00.

Meeks, Wayne A., *The First Urban Christians*. The Social World of the Apostle Paul. x-299 p. 24,2 × 16,2. New Haven – London 1983. Yale University Press. US \$19.95.

O'Brien, Peter T., *Colossians, Philemon* (Word Biblical Commentary 44). LIV-328 p. 23,5 × 17,5. Waco, Texas, 1983. Words Books, Publisher.

Orchard, John Bernard, (Ed.), *A Synopsis of the Four Gospels in Greek*. Arranged According to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis. xxxiv-342 p. 25,9 × 23,7. Edinburgh 1983. T. & T. Clark Limited. £11.95.

Schürmann, Heinz, *Il Vangelo di Luca*. Parte Prima. Testo greco et traduzione. Commento ai capp. 1,1-9,50. Traduzione italiana di Vincenzo Gatti (Commentario Teologico del Nuovo Testamento III/1). 921 p. 22,6 × 15,4. Brescia 1983. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 70.000.

Segalla, Giuseppe, *La preghiera di Gesù al Padre* (Giov. 17). Un addio missionario (Studi Biblici 63). 235 p. 20,7 × 13,7. Brescia 1983. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 15.000.

Trilling, Wolfgang, *Mit Paulus im Gespräch*. Das Lebenswerk des großen Völkerapostels. Eine Hinführung. 176 S. 12 × 19. Graz 1983. Styria. DM 24.80.

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel. Nach **Petrus Sabatier** neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der **Erzabtei Beuron**. 25 (Pars II). Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos. Herausgegeben von Hermann Josef **Frede**. 1. Lieferung. Tt 1,1 – 3,5. p. 850-920. 31,7 × 24. Freiburg 1983. Herder.

Vollständige Konkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament. Unter Zugrundelegung aller modernen kritischen Textausgaben und des Textus Receptus. In Verbindung mit H. **Riesenfeld**, H.-U. **Rosenbaum**, Chr. **Hannick**, B.

Bonsack. Neu zusammengestellt unter der Leitung von K. Aland. Band I, Lieferung 13/14. S. 1153-1352. Berlin - New York 1983. W. de Gruyter. DM 236.

Ziesler, J. A., *Pauline Christianity* (The Oxford Bible Series). 154 p. 19,8 × 13. Oxford - New York 1983. Oxford University Press. £3.50.

Varia

Assmann, Jan, *Re und Amun.* Die Krise des polytheistischen Weltbilds im Ägypten der 18.-20. Dynastie (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 51). xi-309 p. 23,5 × 15,8. Freiburg (Schweiz) - Göttingen 1983. Universitätsverlag - Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Avril C. - Lenhardt, P., *La lecture juive de l'Ecriture* (Conférences, Faculté de Théologie de Lyon) 41 p. 21 × 14,6. Lyon 1983. Editions Profac.

Barth, Markus, *The People of God* (JSOT Supplement Series 5). 97 p. 21,6 × 13,5. Sheffield 1983. Department of Biblical Studies. £4.95.

Bautz, F. J. (Hrsg.) [et alii], *Geschichte der Juden von der biblischen Zeit bis zur Gegenwart.* (Beck'sche Schwarze Reihe 268). 248 S. 18 × 11,8. München 1983. C. H. Beck. DM 22,-.

Beauchamp, P. [et alii], *Bible and Inculturation* (Inculturation III). 125 p. 24,2 × 16,6. Rome 1983. Pontifical Gregorian University.

Betlyon, John Wilson, *The Coinage and Mints of Phoenicia.* The Pre-Alexandrine Period (Harvard Semitic Monographs 26). xi-171. 22,2 × 14,2. Chico, CA, 1983. Scholars Press. US \$18.75.

Brunswick, Sheldon R. (Ed.), *Studies in Judaica, Karaitica and Islamica.* Presented to Leon Nemoy on his Eightieth Birthday. 285 p. 24 × 17,5. Ramat-Gan 1982. Bar-Ilan University Press.

Cenci, Anna Maria, *Perché tanto male sulla terra? Il mistero delle tenebre, del peccato, del dolore innocente.* 112 p. 21,2 × 13,4. Milano 1983. Editore I. P. L. Lit. 6.000.

Consuetudines Monasticae. Eine Festgabe für Kassius Hallinger aus Anlass seines 70. Geburtstages. Herausgegeben von Joachim F. Angerer und Josef Lenzenweger (Studia Anselmiana 85). 446 p. 24 × 17. Roma 1982. Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo.

Davies, Philip R., *The Damascus Covenant.* An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document" (JSOT Supplement Series 25). 267 p. 21,1 × 13,6. Sheffield 1983. Department of Biblical Studies. £8.50.

Dienstag, Jacob I., *Eschatology in Maimonidean Thought.* Messianism, Resurrection and the World To Come (Bibliotheca Maimonidica, Volume II). cxx-281 p. 23,9 × 16. New York, N.Y. 1983. KTAV Publishing House. US \$39.50.

Englezakis, Benedict, *New and Old in God's Revelation*. Studies in Relations between Spirit and Tradition in the Bible. 122 p. 22,2 × 13,9. Cambridge – Crestwood, N.Y. 1982. James Clarke & Co – St. Vladimir's Seminary Press. £9.95.

Epsztein, Léon, *La justice sociale dans le Proche-Orient ancien et le peuple de la Bible*. 274 p. 18,5 × 13,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 69,50.

Fitzgerald, J. T. – White, M., *The Tabula of Cebes* (SBL Texts and Translations 24, Graeco-Roman Religion Series 7). 225 p. 22,7 × 14,9. Chico, CA 1983. Scholars Press. US \$14.25.

García Bazán, Francisco, *Neoplatonismo y Vedānta*. La doctrina de la materia en Plotino y Shānkara (Colección «Oriente - Occidente» 3). XII-284 p. 22,7 × 15,7. Buenos Aires 1982. Ediciones Depalma. FB 495.

Grelot, Pierre, *Eglise et ministères*. Pour un dialogue critique avec Edward Schillebeeckx («Théologies»). 282 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 110.

Hadidi, Adnan (Ed.), *Studies in the History and Archeology of Jordan I*. 399 p. 27 × 22,5. Amman, Jordan 1982. Department of Antiquities. US \$35.00.

Halpérin, J. – Levitte, G., *La Bible au présent*. Actes du XXII^e Colloque des intellectuels juifs de langue française. 347 p. 17,9 × 10,8. Paris 1982. Galilimard.

Henry, Carl F. H., *God, Revelation and Authority*. God Who Stands and Stays, VI, Part Two. 566 p. 23,5 × 16. Waco, Texas 1983. Word Books, Publisher. US \$24.95.

Kehl, M. – Löser, W. (Editors), *The von Balthasar Reader*. Translated by Robert J. Daly and Fred Lawrence. XIV-437 p. 23,4 × 15,6. Edinburgh 1982. T. & T. Clark. £14.95.

Kellermann, M. – Medala, S. – Piccirillo, M. – Sitarz, E., *Welt aus der die Bibel kommt*. Biblische Hilfswissenschaften (Biblische Basis Bücher, Band 2). 263 p. 19,5 × 12,5. Kevelaer – Stuttgart 1982. Butzon & Berker – Katholisches Bibelwert.

King, Philip J., *American Archeology in the Mideast*. A History of the American Schools of Oriental Research. xv-291 p. 23,6 × 15,6. Philadelphia 1983. Eisenbrauns. US \$15.00.

Kuntzmann, Raymond, *Le symbolisme des jumeaux au Proche-Orient ancien*. Naissance, fonction et évolution d'un symbole (Beauchesne Religions 12). 259 p. 24 × 15,9. Paris 1983. Beauchesne. FF 150.

Lapp, Nancy L. (Ed.) (et alii), *The Third Campaign at Tell el-Fûl: The Excavations of 1964* (The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Vol. 45). xvii-156 p. 28,7 × 12. 80 plates; illus.; 15 plans. Winona Lake, Indiana, 1983. American Schools of Oriental Research. US \$25.00.

Lantz, Walter D., *Chosen People, Promised Land. A Drama of the Spirit*. Part I. New York City, 1952. Part II. Lancaster, Pa. 1982. 30 p. 22,3 × 14,4. Lancaster, Pa. 1982. [Privately Printed].

Lécuyer, Joseph, *Le sacrement de l'ordination*. Recherche historique et théologique (Théologie Historique 65). 281 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Paris 1983. Beauchesne. FF 150.

Messer, Leon Judah, *The Book of the Honeycomb's Flow*. Sepher Nōpheth Šūphīm. A Critical Edition and Translation by Isaac **Rabinowitz**. LXX-604 p. 24,1 × 16,1. Ithaca - London 1983. Cornell University Press. US \$71.50.

Mahé, Jean-Pierre, *Hermès en Haute-Egypte*. Tome II: Le fragment du discours parfait et les définitions hermétiques arméniennes (NH VI. 8.8a) (Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi Section «Textes» 7). L-565 p. 24 × 16. Québec, Canada 1982. Les Presses de l'Université Laval. FB 2.500.

Meyer, B. F. - **Sanders**, E. P., (Editors), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (Self-Definition in the Greco-Roman World Vol. 3). xx-295 p. 22,4 × 14,7. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press. US \$24.95.

Meyers, E. M., **Strange**, J. F., **Meyers**, C. L., *Excavations at Ancient Meiron, Upper Galilee*. Israel 1971-72, 1974-75, 1977. Text 178 p.; Plates p. 170-236; Appendices p. 238-276, 31,2 × 31. (Meiron Excavation Project Vol. III). Cambridge, MA, 1981. The American Schools of Oriental Research.

Müller, Augustin Rudolf, *Martin Bubers Verdeutschung der Schrift* (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament. 14. Band). ix-177 p. 21 × 14,9. St. Ottilien 1982. Eos Verlag.

Nielsen, Eduard, *Law, History and Tradition*. Issued by friends and colleagues. 178 p. 23 × 14,6. København 1983. G. E. C. Gads Forlag. D.kr. 134,20.

Peláez del Rosal, Jesús, *El divorcio en el Derecho del Antiguo Oriente (Asiria, Babilonia, Israel)* (Serie: Derecho y Justicia 1). 131 p. 18,5 × 11,5. Córdoba, España 1982. Ediciones El Almendro.

Prévost, Marcel-Henri, *Mélanges à la mémoire de Marcel-Henri Prévost*. Droit biblique - Interprétation rabbinique - Communautés et Société. (Publications de l'Université de Lille II - Droit et Santé). 329 p. 24 × 15,5. Paris 1983. Presses Universitaires de France. FF 130.

Robinson, S. Edward, *The Testament of Adam*. An Examination of the Syriac and Greek Traditions (SBL Dissertation Series 52). xi-196 p. 21,5 × 13,8. Chico, CA 1982. Scholars Press. US \$13.50.

Sawyer, J. F. A. - **Clines**, D. J. A. (Editors). *The History and Archaeology of Late Bronze and Iron Age Jordan and North-West Arabia* (JSOT Supplement Series 24). 172 p. 21,6 × 13,5. Sheffield 1983. Department of Biblical Studies. £8.95.

Schulte, Hannelis, *L'origine della Storiografia nell'Israele Antico* (Biblioteca di Cultura Religiosa 41). 309 p. 21 × 14,7. Brescia 1983. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 20.000.

Studi Storico-Religiosi. Nuova serie di Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni pubblicati dalla Scuola di Studi storico-religiosi dell'Università di Roma. Anno 1982, Vol. VI (Fasc. 1-2). 443 p. 24,1 × 17. L'Aquila 1982. Japadre Editore.

Die Tosefta. Text. Seder I: Zeraim. Hrsg. von Karl Heinrich **Rengstorf** (et alii) (Rabbinische Texte). 341 S. 23,5 × 16. Stuttgart - Berlin - Köln - Mainz 1983. Kohlhammer. DM 348,-.

de Vogüé, Adalbert, *Les Règles des Saints Pères*. Tome II. Trois Règles du VI^e Siècle incorporant des Textes Lériniens (Sources Chrétiennes 298). p. 409-677. 19 × 12,5. Paris 1982. Le Cerf. FF 169.

Wacholder, Ben Zion, *The Dawn of Qumran*. The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness. xv-310 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Cincinnati 1983. Hebrew Union College Press. US \$25.00.

Zaoui, André C., *Jewish Sources of the Koran*. 269 p. 21,7 × 14,5. Jerusalem 1983. Author's Edition.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

SCUOLA TIPOGRAFICA S. PIO X - VIA DEGLI ETRUSCHI, 7-9 ROMA - Ottobre 1983